This edition, titled **Pre June 2014 Edition** applies to all faculty hired before June 2014 and is applicable for personnel and evaluation considerations (pre tenure, tenure, promotion, and post tenure decisions) before Academic Year 2018-2019.

For any faculty member uncertain as to their situation due to changes in appointment type or tenure track status, etc. it is their responsibility to seek clarification and have a joint statement of resolution signed by the dean and department chair inserted into their personnel file.

College of Business Administration

Personnel Policies and Procedures, Pre June 2014 Edition

Promotion and Tenure Procedures

1. Creation of the Portfolio Supporting a Faculty Member's Application for Promotion or Tenure

The college specific guidelines a faculty member should follow in putting together a portfolio of material to support his/her application for promotion or tenure are provided below.

In the preparation of the portfolio, the Winthrop University guidelines (available in .pdf format, 20 kb) would also inform the process and the consideration of the credentials of the candidate. In the event that simultaneous applications for promotion and tenure are submitted, a single supporting portfolio for both processes will be used. For each process, the letter of application from the faculty member, recommendations from the Chair and the Dean, and all reports must be submitted separately, as each review process will occur independently.

2. Responsibilities of Persons Involved in the Process of Promotion and Tenure

a. The Faculty Member

1. In matters regarding promotion or tenure it is the responsibility of each faculty member to provide to his/her department chair appropriate evidence of performance and activities relevant to promotion or tenure decisions. Faculty members must understand the importance of their providing such supporting materials, particularly in the area of teaching effectiveness.

2. By February 1 each faculty member is to submit to his/her department chair an annual report that accurately and thoroughly describes activities of the faculty member during the previous calendar year (activities of Spring, Summer, and Fall semesters). Chair/faculty interviews are completed by April 15.

b. The Department Chair

1. The chair, along with the dean, is to communicate clearly to faculty the policies of the College of Business Administration with regard to promotion and tenure. This includes indicating to faculty that the number of years in rank listed in this document are the minimum number of years that normally are to be completed before application for promotion or tenure is to be submitted.

2. It is the responsibility of the department chair to stay current with the progress of each faculty member and to provide timely and continuous coaching to each faculty member, especially with regard to promotion and tenure. Review by the chair of each faculty member's goals during the annual review process is integral to this process.

3. In offering guidance to and conducting reviews of a faculty member the department chair should take note of differences in faculty workloads in such areas as number of course preparations, difficulty of courses taught, type of research undertaken, demands of university and community service obligations, and involvement with student activities outside of the classroom.

4. When a faculty member is a candidate for promotion or tenure, his/her department chair must submit in writing to the appropriate committee a full and frank appraisal of all aspects of the candidate's performance in each of the relevant performance categories, including a clear statement of the level of support the chair provides the candidate.

5. The department chair is to follow the procedure for review of annual reports as outlined beginning on page 13.

6. In the performance appraisal process faculty will comment on that year's scholarly activity and offer evidence of the quality of publications. It is the responsibility of the department chair to provide feedback to the faculty member on the quality of the article and journal outlet. In addition, for annual reports, and for promotion and tenure decisions, the department chair is expected to provide a written statement on the quality of each individual scholarly activity article as described on pages 25-28.

c. The Dean

1. The dean, along with the department chair, is to communicate clearly in writing to faculty the expectations of the College of Business Administration with regard to promotion and tenure.

2. It is the responsibility of the dean to see that the manner in which chairs evaluate faculty is consistent across all departments.

3. The dean is to follow the procedure for review of annual reports as outlined on pages 26-29.

4. This document does not prohibit or diminish the authority of the dean to assign or appoint academic rank to administrative employees. However, the dean may seek the advice of the College of Business Administration personnel committee concerning the appropriateness of such an appointment.

d. The College of Business Administration Personnel Committee

1. Serving on the Committee. Serving on the College of Business Administration personnel committee is a serious responsibility. Acceptance of election to this committee mandates that the member diligently study all candidates' materials, become familiar with all applicable college and university personnel policies, and accept compliance with all relevant timetables. Members must be willing to speak openly in committee deliberations but treat as strictly confidential all such deliberations and all other matters related to candidates' applications.

2. Pre-Tenure Review. During the spring semester of a tenure-track faculty member's third year of tenure eligibility, he/she will receive a pre-tenure review from the College of Business Administration personnel committee, his/her department chair, and the dean. This will allow the faculty member to receive a written statement stating if he/she is on track for the desired goal. It will also allow the candidate to see if the dean, chair, and personnel committee are in agreement on the applicant's progress.

Process for Determining Faculty Qualification Status

Updated June 2012, August 2013, October 2013

Faculty Qualifications and Engagement - Status

Rationale

AACSB and ABET accreditation standards clearly articulate the need for schools to demonstrate that faculty are current in their field of teaching. The requirement is first met on the individual level. The criteria for determining qualification status is grounded in the Personnel Policies and Procedures section of the College of Business Administration Faculty Manual but is not used for the same purposes as those described in the Manual. This document, the Process for Determining Faculty Qualification Status, is an expression of minimal levels of currency, not eligibility for promotion, tenure, or merit pay increases. The AACSB language is quite clear and helps in defining qualified faculty status:

"Qualified faculty status applies to faculty members who sustain intellectual capital in their fields of teaching, demonstrating currency and relevance of intellectual capital to support the school's mission, expected outcomes, and strategies, including teaching, scholarship, and other mission components. Categories for specifying qualified faculty status are based on the initial academic preparation, initial professional experience, and sustained academic and professional engagement...." (AACSB 2013 Business Accreditation Standard 15, Faculty Qualifications and Engagement).

The standards are specific in that business schools and computer science programs are expected to recruit and maintain a roster of qualified teaching faculty. To meet our mission requirements for excellent teaching in a supportive learning community and preparing students to be competitive in the global market, we must have a “portfolio of intellectual contributions,” which can provide evidence of faculty currency in their field and adds vitality to the classroom. Our portfolio must include contributions to learning and pedagogical research, contributions to practice, and disciplined-based scholarship.

Principles and Process

The principles used in making the qualification determination are based on the evaluation language in the CBA Faculty Manual (numbers of articles, quality, continuity, field appropriateness, authorship, and impact). The process is organized around a data reporting and organizing format. A description of the process and how it is operationalized is given below. When individual data is gathered and decisions are made on an individual basis, a summary matrix is created.

Faculty are considered to be qualified according to the guidelines presented below. Decisions are made by the Qualifications Committee, consisting of the Dean, Assistant Dean for Professional Development, and Department Chairs. Chairs are responsible for collecting candidate material, comparing resume content to the standards, and making the original case. The Committee is collectively responsible for evaluating the quality of the case as presented and making the determination as to whether or not an individual faculty member or candidate would be considered qualified.

Definitions

According to the 2013 AACSB Accreditation Standard 15, "initial academic preparation is assessed by earned degrees and other academic credentials. Initial professional experience is assessed by the nature, level, and duration of leadership and management position(s) in the practice of business and/or other types of organizational work. Sustained academic and professional engagement is combined with initial academic preparation and initial professional experience to maintain and augment qualifications (i.e., currency and relevance in the field of teaching) of a faculty member over time. Academic engagement reflects faculty scholarly development activities that support integration of relevant, current theory of business and management consistent with the school's mission, expected outcomes, and supporting strategies. And, professional engagement reflects faculty practice-oriented development activities that support integration of relevant, current practice of business and management consistent with the school's mission, expected outcomes, and supporting strategies" (2013 AACSB Accreditation Standard 15).

According to AACSB Standard 15, "categories for specifying qualified faculty status are based on the initial academic preparation, initial professional experience, and sustained academic and professional engagement as described below."

Scholarly Academics (SA) sustain currency and relevance through scholarship and related activities. Normally, SA status is granted to newly hired faculty members who earned their research doctorates within the last five years prior to the review dates.

Practice Academics (PA) sustain currency and relevance through professional engagement, interaction, and relevant activities. Normally, PA status applies to faculty members who augment their initial preparation as academic scholars with development and engagement activities that involve substantive linkages to practice, consulting, other forms of professional engagement, etc., based on the faculty members' earlier work as an SA faculty member.

Scholarly Practitioners (SP) sustain currency and relevance through continued professional experience, engagement, or interaction and scholarship related to their professional background and experience. Normally, SP status applies to practitioner faculty members who augment their experience with development and engagement activities involving substantive scholarly activities in their fields of teaching.

Instructional Practitioners (IP) sustain currency and relevance through continued professional experience and engagement related to their professional backgrounds and experience. Normally, IP status is granted to newly hired faculty members who join the faculty with significant and substantive professional experience.

Qualification Status

Initial Academic Preparation for Scholarly Academic and Practice Academic Faculty members are evaluated first by degree. It is assumed a faculty member has an appropriate terminal degree or has validated a related degree by additional training, experience, or program of research. Those with a new PhD (< 3 years, with dissertation only) will be assumed to be qualified as a scholarly academic. In the years between 3 and 5 it is expected that the person will have journal articles accepted and some other types of scholarly activity. Chairs will coach faculty on their program of research and what is forthcoming. Those with terminal degrees more than 5 years old will be further evaluated by the system described below on their record of research, professional development, or other intellectual development experiences.

Sustained Qualifications for Scholarly Academic
Qualification as a Scholarly Academic is maintained by publishing 3 or more refereed journal articles or 2 refereed journal articles and 1 Professional Engagement or Intellectual Development Experience (PIDE; defined below) within the last 5 years. It is expected that a faculty member will not drop below Category 3 in either Table 4 or Table 5 within the faculty manual for more than two consecutive years. (The Category 3 or above standard applies strictly to all decisions regarding tenure, promotion or merit pay consideration.) Consideration is also given to teaching and service. Since the mission has a degree of emphasis on teaching and service, qualification cannot be sustained without acceptable evaluations on student intellectual development and professional stewardship in the Faculty Evaluation process.

Professional Engagement or Intellectual Development Experience (PIDE)
A professional engagement or intellectual development experience is an activity or accomplishment that is considered to add value to an independent third-party. Typically, the third-party has “purchased” the talent or expertise of a faculty member, either literally or by selecting the faculty member to perform a highly valued function. The rationale for a PIDE experience is that a faculty member possesses a certain degree of current knowledge, skill, or ability that is sought after by the business community or by others in academe. Examples of

validating PIDE experiences for qualification as a Scholarly Academic (SA) include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. A faculty internship where a faculty member works full-time for a company for a minimum period of time (at least 5 weeks);

2. Major editorial responsibilities such as editor-in-chief or executive editor of a journal or practitioner periodical;

3. A funded grant proposal from a major funding agency;

4. Authoring a textbook or revising an edition of a textbook;

5. Writing an invited article for an academic journal or a nationally-known practitioner periodical;

6. Obtaining new (and appropriate) professional certification;

7. Participating in evaluation teams, such as SACS, AACSB, ABET, or other discipline specific visits;

8. Taking a course in a new or emerging field with implications for primary field;

9. Authorship of a peer reviewed, proceedings publication; and

10. Authorship of a research monograph, book, chapter in a book, peer-reviewed paper presentation, faculty research seminar, or non-peer reviewed journal article.

Sustained Qualifications for Practice Academic

Faculty members that have an appropriate terminal degree or validated a related degree by additional training, experience, or program of research can also be qualified as a Practice Academic. Qualification as a Practice Academic is maintained by high levels of professional engagement and activity. The primary responsibility for Practice Academics is to insure their knowledge is current and can sustain the scrutiny of their peers and this acceptance is documented. For example, qualifications can be obtained through active involvement in the professional community through delivery of papers, membership in professional associations, continuing education, and certifications. Certifications would mean maintaining an existing one or accomplishing new professional designations or licenses. Special circumstances will be addressed in agreement with the individual faculty member and Qualifications Committee. In addition, since the mission has a degree of emphasis on teaching and service, qualification cannot be sustained without acceptable evaluations on student intellectual development and professional stewardship in the Faculty Evaluation process.

Practice Academics are considered qualified if they have completed at least one scholarship activity (i.e., see item 17 below) and four other significant professional engagement or intellectual development experiences (PIDEs; see items 1-16 below) over the past five years.

Examples of validating PIDE experiences for qualification as a Practice Academic (PA) include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Significant involvement in operation of a business (part time involvement), related to a faculty member's field;

2. A faculty internship of one month or longer in which the faculty member has been given a set of responsibilities to execute;

3. Significant continuing education sessions in the discipline related to a faculty member's field (related to certification/license);

4. Continuing existing or obtaining new (and appropriate) professional certifications and licenses;

5. On retainer from a company;

6. Presentations to faculty on a company, industry, or discipline;

7. Active in practitioner associations, providing interaction with peer level professionals;

8. Participate in industry specific seminars (strategy sessions, lobbying efforts, regulatory compliance, etc.);

9. Attend conference in discipline;

10. Attend conference in pedagogy;

11. Participate in programs that shape the relationship between higher education and standards required in an industry (such as consultation on content, administration, or grading of CPA, CFP or AP examinations);

12. Maintain a significant consulting experience with multiple clients and substantial revenues;

13. Creating and/or delivering executive education seminars that are well attended;

14. Publishing (and sustaining the publication of) a newsletter or sequence of reports that attracts a robust subscription base;

15. Completing college courses related to the field of instruction;

16. Serving as a member of a board of directors, making a substantial contribution related to the faculty member's field; and

17. Scholarship (including, but not limited to published journal articles, research monographs, scholarly books, chapters in scholarly books, textbooks or accompanying supplements, proceedings from scholarly meetings, papers presented at academic or professional meetings, publicly available research working papers, papers presented at faculty research

seminars, publications in trade journals, in-house journals, book reviews, written cases with instructional materials, instructional materials, instructors manuals, instructional software, and other publicly available materials describing the design and implementation of new curricula or courses).

Initial Professional Experience for Scholarly Practitioner and Instructional Practitioner

Those faculty hired without a terminal degree but with significant professional experience can also be qualified as Scholarly or Instructional Practitioners. Scholarly and Instructional Practitioners will typically have a master's degree or significant graduate level training in a field related to the area of teaching assignment. In addition, at the beginning of an appointment as a Scholarly or Instructional Practitioner the candidate must have a position with significant authority for a duration sufficient to allow development of expertise related to the area of teaching assignment. These faculty members will have high level business experience with significant authority and responsibility for a sufficient duration to allow them to bring practitioner insights to their areas of teaching assignment.

The candidate and the Department Chair will collaborate to establish and document a portfolio to show initial qualification for hire. Qualifications will be intellectual contributions, professional development activities, and/or professional experience. Prior to hire, qualifications are reviewed by the Qualifications Committee, consisting of the Dean, Associate Dean for Professional Development, and Department Chairs. Chairs are responsible for collecting candidate material, comparing resume content to the standards, and making the original case. Then, the Committee is collectively responsible for evaluating the quality of the case as presented and making the determination as to whether or not a candidate would be considered qualified. If deemed qualified, the portfolio at hiring for the new faculty member is assumed to be current for 5 years.

Sustained Qualifications for Scholarly Practitioners

Qualification as a Scholarly Practitioner is maintained by publishing 3 or more referred journal articles or 2 referred journal articles and 1 Professional Engagement or Intellectual Development Experience (PIDE; see below) within the last 5 years. It is expected that a faculty member will not drop below Category 3 in either Table 4 or Table 5 within the faculty manual for more than two consecutive years. (The Category 3 or above standard applies strictly to all decisions regarding tenure, promotion or merit pay consideration.) Consideration is also given to teaching and service. Since the mission has a degree of emphasis on teaching and service, qualification cannot be sustained without acceptable evaluations on student intellectual development and professional stewardship in the Faculty Evaluation process.

Examples of validating PIDE experiences for qualification as a Scholarly Practitioner (SP) include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. A faculty internship where a faculty member works full-time for a company for a minimum period of time (at least 5 weeks);

2. Major editorial responsibilities such as editor-in-chief or executive editor or a journal or practitioner periodical;

3. A funded grant proposal from a major funding agency;

4. Authoring a textbook or revising an edition of a textbook;

5. Writing an invited article for an academic journal or a nationally-known practitioner periodical;

6. Obtaining new (and appropriate) professional certification;

7. Participating in evaluation teams, such as SACS, AACSB, ABET, or other discipline specific visits;

8. Taking a course in a new or emerging field with implications for primary field;

9. Authorship of a peer-reviewed, proceedings publication; and

10. Authorship of a research monograph, book, chapter in a book, peer-reviewed paper presentation, faculty research seminar, or non-peer reviewed journal article.

Sustained Qualifications for Instructional Practitioners

Faculty members without a terminal degree but with significant professional experience can also be initially qualified as Instructional Practitioners. Qualification as an Instructional Practitioner is maintained by continued high levels of professional involvement and activity. The primary responsibility for Instructional Practitioners is to insure their knowledge is current and can sustain the scrutiny of their peers and this acceptance is documented. For example, qualifications can be obtained through active involvement in the professional community through delivery of papers, membership in professional associations, continuing education, and certifications. Certifications would mean maintaining an existing one or accomplishing new professional designations or licenses. Special circumstances will be addressed in agreement with the individual faculty member and Qualifications Committee. In addition, since the mission has a degree of emphasis on teaching and service, qualification cannot be sustained without acceptable evaluations on student intellectual development and professional stewardship in the Faculty Evaluation process.

A faculty member who was initially qualified at the time of hire and meets any of the following conditions during the previous five-year period will continue to be qualified as an Instructional Practitioner (IP) if he/she:

1. Is currently working full-time (or almost full-time) in business with job responsibilities, significant in duration and responsibility, related to the field or teaching assignment; or

2. Has completed at least five professional engagement or intellectual development experiences (PIDEs; see items 1-17 below) over the past five years.

   Examples of validating PIDE experiences for qualification as an Instructional Practitioner (IP) include, but are not limited to, the following;

1. Significant involvement in operation of a business (part-time involvement), related to a faculty member's field;

2. A faculty internship of one month or longer in which the faculty member has been given a set of responsibilities to execute;

3. Significant continuing education sessions in the discipline related to a faculty member's field (related to certification/license);

4. Continuing existing or obtaining new (and appropriate) professional certifications and licenses;

5. On retainer from a company;

6. Presentations to faculty on a company, industry, or discipline;

7. Active in practitioner associations, providing interaction with peer level professionals;

8. Participate in industry specific seminars (strategy sessions, lobbying efforts, regulatory compliance, etc.);

9. Attend conference in discipline;

10. Attend conference in pedagogy;

11. Participate in programs that shape the relationship between higher education and standards required in an industry (such as consultation on content, administration, or grading of CPA, CFP or AP examinations);

12. Maintain a significant consulting experience with multiple clients and substantial revenues;

13. Creating and/or delivering executive education seminars that are well attended;

14. Publishing (and sustaining the publication of) a newsletter or sequence of reports that attracts a robust subscription base;

15. Completing college courses related to the field of instruction;

16. Serving as a member of a board of directors, making a substantial contribution related to the faculty member's field; and

17. Scholarship (including, but not limited to published journal articles, research monographs, scholarly books, chapters in scholarly books, textbooks or accompanying supplements, proceedings from scholarly meetings, papers presented at academic or professional meetings, publicly available research working papers, papers presented at faculty research seminars, publications in trade journals, in-house journals, book reviews, written cases with instructional materials, instructional materials, instructors

manuals, instructional software, and other publicly available materials describing the design and implementation of new curricula or courses).

Authority

For initial full time appointments, the decision on a faculty member's status as either Academically Qualified or Professionally Qualified will be made as a recommendation from the Search Committee with final authority resting with the CBA Qualifications Committee, comprised of the Dean, Assistant Dean for Professional Development, and Department Chairs. Decisions will be reconfirmed each year as part of the Annual Review Process and the Faculty Qualifications Status document reviewed by the CBA Qualifications Committee.

For the part time appointment, the decision on a faculty member's status as either Academically Qualified or Professionally Qualified will be made by the CBA Qualifications Committee. For appointments after the first semester, the status will be reviewed and confirmed by the CBA Qualifications Committee each semester of employment.

Documentation

The following documentation will be completed by the Assistant Dean for Professional Development based on data provided by the faculty member and department chair. Updates should be submitted directly to the faculty qualifications database. Other PIDE information impacting status should be provided to the Assistant Dean for Professional Development as they occur. This information will be updated every semester with the official version being completed in February of each year. It is the faculty member's responsibility to monitor the accuracy of the information in the faculty qualifications database as well as all required supporting documentation necessary to determine status (digital copies of papers and articles, hard copies of articles and papers, PIDE documentation, etc.). The College of Business Faculty Qualifications report is generated from the faculty qualifications database. A representation is available in .pdf format.

Guidelines for Determining Participating and Supporting Faculty

Updated June 2012

According to AACSB standard 9 (2012 of Eligibility Procedures and Standards for Business Accreditation), the College of Business Administration must maintain a faculty that is sufficiently involved in the activities of Winthrop University.

"In assessing sufficiency of faculty resources, an important distinction is made between Participating and Supporting faculty members. This distinction categorizes faculty members into those who are participants in the life of the school beyond direct teaching involvement, and those who are not. While the specifics differentiating these categories vary from school to school, the definitions must be made with enough clarity that it is not difficult to place any particular faculty member into the correct classification" (p. 38).
In addition, participating faculty members will deliver the vast majority of the school's teaching.

“Normally, participating faculty members consistently deliver at least 75 percent of the school's annual teaching (whether measured by credit hours, contact hours, or other metric appropriate to the school). Normally, Participating faculty members consistently deliver at least 60 percent of the teaching in each discipline, each academic program, and location” (p. 39).

A College of Business Administration faculty member will be designated as participating if he/she completes three of the following criteria in a year:

1. Serves on a department, college, or university committee
2. Advises students
3. Advises a business student organization or engages in chapter activities
4. Regularly attends and participates in department meetings
5. Regularly attends and participates in CBA faculty assemblies
6. Participates in the assessment system of the college
7. Attends professional development activities of sponsored by Winthrop University or the College of Business Administration
8. Has scholarly activity

The above activities will be documented via the College’s faculty qualifications database. It is the faculty member’s responsibility to submit updates directly to the database, monitor the accuracy of information in the faculty qualifications database, and provide all required supporting documentation.

Personnel Review Procedures

The policies and procedures described in this section apply to tenured faculty and untenured faculty on a tenure track. For faculty not on a tenure track, deans and chairs will confer with the faculty member concerning relevant policies. Faculty are evaluated on criteria that measure academic responsibility, student intellectual development, scholarly activity, and professional stewardship. The criteria are applied in four review processes: (1) annual review, (2) pre-tenure review, (3) tenure, and (4) promotion. At the college level, there are four entities involved in the review processes: (1) the faculty member, (2) the department chair, (3) the dean, and (4) the College of Business Administration (CBA) Personnel Committee. The sections that follow contain descriptions of: (1) the four review processes; (2) the responsibilities of the four entities; (3) the criteria for academic responsibility, student intellectual development, scholarly activity, and professional stewardship used in each review process; and (4) the application of the criteria. It should be noted that faculty workload and evaluation should be allocated as 60% for student intellectual development, 25% for scholarly activity, and 15% for professional stewardship.

Faculty are also evaluated on these same criteria in post-tenure review. The post-tenure review process is described in the Winthrop University Faculty Manual.

1. Descriptions in the Review Process

a. Annual Review

The dean will set the timetable for the annual review process. The annual review process consists of two documents; 1) the Faculty Annual Report which is compiled from records maintained in the faculty qualifications database, Activity Insight/Digital Measures and 2) the annual review completed by the department chair. The dates that follow are approximate and can vary slightly from year to year. By February 1, each faculty member is to submit to his/her department chair a written annual report that accurately and thoroughly describes academic responsibility, student intellectual development, scholarly activity, and professional stewardship activities for the spring, summer, and fall semesters of the previous calendar year (January 1 – December 31). This report should include a section for faculty development plans for both a one- and five-year planning horizon. For the one- and five-year planning horizons, the faculty member should address progress for the year under review and specify revisions where appropriate for the new planning horizons. The chair and the dean individually will evaluate each annual report during the spring semester. By April 15, the following actions regarding the faculty member's annual report are taken by the dean and the department chair:

1. The chair will prepare a written review of the faculty member's annual report.
2. The chair will discuss with the dean the faculty member's annual report and the chair's written review of that report.
3. The dean will prepare a written review of the faculty member's annual report.
4. The faculty member and chair will meet to discuss the written reviews from the dean and the chair. At this time, the two parties will discuss the one- and five-year development plans, if appropriate, discuss why certain goals were not achieved and what action or support is needed to meet the faculty member's goals for the next year.

Through this review process, the faculty member receives feedback from the dean and department chair on his/her strengths and weaknesses and ways to improve performance. The dean and chair also provide feedback for the one-year and five-year development plans.

b. Pre-Tenure Review

Probationary faculty (i.e., those on a tenure-track appointment) in the CBA participate in a pre- tenure review, usually in the third probationary year, to evaluate their progress toward tenure. The primary purpose of pre-tenure review is to provide probationary faculty members feedback on their achievements and progress and to provide suggestions for future actions as required by the criteria for tenure at Winthrop University. The pre-tenure review is an integral part of the development of probationary faculty members.

The review is conducted by the CBA Personnel Committee and department chair. The written reports are forwarded to the dean, who meets with the candidate and chair to discuss the review. Results of this review need not be included in the tenure portfolio unless the candidate chooses to include the results.

For candidates with no prior credit toward tenure, the pre-tenure review takes place in the spring semester of the third year of the candidate's probationary period. If a candidate is hired with one or two years' credit toward tenure, the review will take place in the second year of employment at Winthrop. Candidates who were hired with credit for tenure must provide a statement accounting for the work that occurred in the years of credit that accrued while employed at another institution. If a candidate is hired with three years' credit toward tenure, a pre-tenure review will ordinarily not be conducted unless the review is requested by the candidate. Application and review for promotion cannot be substituted for pre-tenure review.

The step-by-step procedures for pre-tenure review are listed below:

1. The department chair informs the candidate of the schedule for the pre-tenure review and provides information on the criteria and recommended documentation for tenure. The CBA Checklist for Pre-Tenure Portfolio is available in .pdf format (83 kb.) The department chair provides notice to the CBA Personnel Committee of those candidates subject to pre-tenure review in that year.
2. The candidate prepares documentation for the committee following the format for tenure review. The candidate uses forms and criteria provided by the CBA and the university. The material submitted should follow the general guidelines circulated for tenure review. The language of these guidelines may not seem exactly appropriate but the spirit of the pre-tenure review is the same as that for tenure. For example, the tenure material suggests the candidate include an "application letter" which is essentially a self-analysis of the candidate's strengths, weaknesses, and progress. The candidate is free to add any material deemed by the candidate to be appropriate and supportive of the evaluation process.
3. The committee reviews the documentation according to the criteria for tenure. The committee drafts a report about the candidate indicating the individual's progress toward tenure with specific recommendations for areas that need improvement and/or development. The report is addressed to the candidate. The committee also forwards a copy of the report to the department chair. If the candidate is a department chair, a copy of the report is sent to the dean.
4. The department chair indicates in writing his or her degree of concurrence with the committee's report and meets with the candidate to discuss the reports from the committee and chair. All discussions during this meeting are preliminary. Conclusions are not final until after the meeting with the candidate, the chair and the dean (item 5). If the candidate is a chair, the dean indicates in writing his or her agreement with the committee's report and discusses the report with the candidate.
5. The written reports are forwarded to the dean, who meets with the candidate and the chair to discuss the reports and the candidate's progress toward tenure. The dean may meet with the candidate based on the written reports from the committee and chair or may review the entire portfolio as submitted by the candidate. The dean provides a written statement.

The time-table for the pre-tenure review process is determined by the dean each year. The dates shown below are approximate dates and will vary slightly from year to year:

September 1	Portfolio is submitted to the dean's office.
September 15	Department chairs notify candidates that the pre-tenure review will be conducted. The dean and the CBA Personnel Committee are informed of the
February 15	Documentation for the review is submitted by the candidate to the department chair, who shares it with the CBA Personnel Committee.
March 15	The CBA Personnel Committee prepares a report on the candidate's performance and a copy of this report is forwarded to the department chair.
March 31	The candidate and chair discuss the CBA Personnel Committee's report.
April 15	Written recommendations from the chair and the CBA Personnel Committee are forwarded to the dean.
May 1	The dean prepares a written statement for the candidate.
	The dean schedules a meeting with the candidate and chair to discuss recommendations from the CBA Personnel Committee, the chair, and the

c. Tenure

Each year the Vice President for Academic Affairs publishes a timetable for the tenure process. The dates that follow are approximate dates and vary slightly from year to year. Normally, during the fall of the sixth year of a candidate's probationary appointment, including any credit given for prior service (credit for prior service is discussed in the pre-tenure review section), the candidate prepares a tenure portfolio according to the guidelines of the CBA. (Note, like pre- tenure review, tenure candidates who were hired with credit for tenure must provide a statement accounting for the work that occurred in the years of credit that accrued while employed at another institution.) The dean's office will add to the portfolio copies of student teaching evaluations, annual reports, and annual reviews for each year of the candidate's probationary period as well as the section in the CBA Faculty Manual section on Personnel Policies and Procedures. The candidate's pre-tenure review can be added to the portfolio at the request of the candidate. This material is forwarded to the department chair.

The department chair reviews all materials and adds his/her report and recommendation to the portfolio. The portfolio is then forwarded to the CBA Personnel Committee. After careful review of the portfolio, the CBA Personnel Committee adds its report and recommendation to the portfolio and forwards the material to the dean. The dean takes into consideration the material in the portfolio and adds his/her report and recommendation to the portfolio. Once the dean's recommendation has been added to the portfolio, the process continues according to the steps specified in the Winthrop University Faculty Manual.

Once the candidate submits the portfolio to the department chair no material can be deleted from the portfolio. No material can be added to the portfolio by the candidate without the approval of all prior review bodies.

d. Post-Tenure Review

Faculty are also evaluated on these same criteria in post-tenure review. The post-tenure review process is described in the Winthrop University Faculty Manual.

e. Promotion

Definition of Ranks. The CBA and Winthrop University recognize the following faculty ranks: Instructor, Senior Instructor, and Adjunct, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. Specific requirements for rank described below are consistent with the requirements outlined in the Winthrop University Faculty Manual.

Contingent Appointments: A candidate for the title of Instructor, Senior Instructor, or Adjunct is expected to have earned at least a master's degree (or its equivalent) in his/her field of specialization and to offer evidence or promise of competence in student intellectual development, competence in professional stewardship, and commitment to academic responsibility. Instructors and Senior Instructors are appointed for terms of one year with appointments to additional one-year terms permitted. Adjuncts are appointed for terms of one semester with appointments to additional semesters permitted. While instructors, senior instructors, and adjuncts are not eligible for tenure or promotion, an individual holding these ranks may be reappointed to a higher rank in a position that may be tenure track.

Assistant Professor: A candidate for the title of Assistant Professor normally is required to hold either (1) an earned master's degree in the field of specialization, or (2) an earned doctorate or other appropriate terminal degree in the field of specialization. Faculty holding this rank offer evidence of potential in student intellectual development, scholarly activity, and professional stewardship that can lead to tenure or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

Associate Professor: A candidate for the title of Associate Professor, a senior rank in the faculty, normally is required to have an earned doctorate in the field of specialization. Outstanding accomplishment in the professional work setting or outstanding intellectual contributions can serve in place of a doctorate and teaching experience. The candidate must demonstrate a high level of performance in student intellectual development, scholarly activity, and university professional stewardship. In addition, the candidate must demonstrate a high level of performance in either the community or discipline professional stewardship categories. In the typical case, the minimum time an individual holds the Assistant Professor title is five years before being promoted to the rank of Associate Professor; however, candidates with exceptional qualifications may apply for an early promotion. Faculty at this rank are expected to maintain at least a level of performance consistent with the requirements for promotion to this rank.

Professor: A candidate for the title of Professor normally is required to hold an earned doctorate in the field of specialization. Outstanding professional work experience or outstanding intellectual contributions can serve in lieu of a doctorate and teaching experience. The candidate must demonstrate a high level of performance in student intellectual development, scholarly activity, and university professional stewardship. In addition, the candidate must demonstrate a high level of performance in either the community or discipline stewardship categories. The candidate must demonstrate continued development beyond that expected for promotion to Associate Professor. A record of maturity and leadership in activities in the university, the community, or his/her discipline can be evidence of such development. The minimum time for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor usually is six years; however, candidates with exceptional qualifications may apply for an early promotion. Faculty at this rank are expected to maintain at least a level of performance consistent with the requirements for promotion to this rank.

1. Procedural Guidelines

   Each year the Vice President for Academic Affairs publishes a timetable for the promotion process. The dates that follow are approximate dates and vary slightly from year to year. Application for promotion is initiated by the candidate by returning a promotion review form by June 1. Forms will be available beginning May 1. The promotion review form, along with a promotion portfolio prepared according to the guidelines of the CBA, is submitted to the dean's office by September 1. The dean's office will add to the portfolio copies of the candidate's student teaching evaluations, annual reports, annual reviews for the appropriate time frame, and the section in the CBA Faculty Manual on Personnel Policies and Procedures. This material is forwarded to the department chair.

   The department chair reviews all materials and adds his/her report and recommendation to the portfolio. The portfolio is forwarded to the CBA Personnel Committee. After careful review of the portfolio, the CBA Personnel Committee adds their report and recommendation to the portfolio and forwards the material to the dean. The dean takes into consideration the material in the portfolio and adds his/her report and recommendation to the portfolio.

   If the dean's recommendation is positive, all materials are submitted to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. If the dean's recommendation is negative, no materials are submitted to the Vice President of Academic Affairs. In such a case, the candidate is provided an oral summary by the dean of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses identified in the review process. If the dean disagrees with a positive recommendation from the CBA Personnel Committee in two consecutive years, the promotion portfolio will be forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, unless the candidate requests otherwise, within 30 days of notification.

   Once the candidate submits the portfolio to the department chair no material can be deleted from the portfolio. No material can be added to the portfolio by the candidate without the approval of all prior review bodies.

   In the event that simultaneous applications for promotion and tenure are submitted, a single supporting portfolio for both procedures will be used. The letters of application and recommendations for each process must be submitted separately as each review process will occur independently.

The descriptions for Associate Professor and Professor provided above are based on specific minimum time frames of five and six years, respectively. In making recommendations for promotion to these ranks, evidence to meet the criteria is not limited to these minimum time frames. Accumulated evidence of performance and productivity from outside these minimum time frames is relevant in promotion deliberations. For example, evidence of leadership and maturity may require more than the minimum time frame. While tenure is based on a rather specific time interval, promotion is generally more often earned over a career (including service at other institutions) rather than from efforts in any prescribed time period.

2. Responsibilities in the Review Process

a. The Faculty Member

For each review process, it is the responsibility of faculty to provide his/her department chair appropriate evidence of performance and activities relevant to the review process. Faculty must understand the importance of providing such supporting materials. In addition, faculty must provide written comments on the quality of each accepted or published scholarly activity article accepted or published that year.

During the annual review the department chair will discuss the faculty member’s current and future one- and five-year development plans. Where appropriate the faculty member may modify the one- and five-year development plans as a result of the department chair’s comments.

It is the responsibility of each faculty member to seek feedback from the chair and the dean regarding personal progress and developmental activities to improve performance. Faculty are expected to take advantage of appropriate development activities as made available by the college and university.

b. The Department Chair

The chair, along with the dean, is to communicate clearly to faculty the policies of the CBA with regard to all review procedures. This includes indicating to faculty that the numbers of years in rank listed in this document are the minimum number of years that normally are to be completed before application for promotion or tenure is to be submitted.

It is the responsibility of the department chair to stay current with the progress of each faculty member and provide timely and continuous coaching to each faculty member, especially with regard to tenure. The review by the chair of the faculty member's goals in the annual review process is integral to this process. In addition to mentoring and evaluation, the chair will also discuss appropriate faculty development activities for student intellectual development, scholarly activity, and professional stewardship.

When a faculty member is a candidate for pre-tenure review, tenure, or promotion, his/her department chair must submit in writing a full and frank appraisal of all aspects of the candidate's performance in each of the relevant performance categories to the appropriate committee. This appraisal must include a clear statement of the level of support the chair provides the candidate. For pre-tenure review, the department chair's appraisal is completed after receipt of the CBA Personnel Committee's written evaluation. For tenure and promotion, the department chair's appraisal is sent to the CBA Personnel Committee prior to that committee's deliberations of the candidate.

The department chair is to follow the procedure for review of annual reports as outlined in earlier sections. It is important that the department chair provide written feedback regarding the goals statement of each faculty member. In addition, the chair must provide written comments on the quality of each accepted or published scholarly activity article accepted or published that year.

It is the responsibility of the department chair to guide and advise individual faculty in the development of his/her student intellectual development and scholarly activity portfolio. It is particularly important that the chair provide feedback on the quality, field appropriateness, and authorship for items in the scholarly activity portfolio.

It is the responsibility of the department chair to provide feedback to individual faculty regarding academic responsibility with respect to student intellectual development, scholarly activity and professional stewardship.

c. The Dean

The dean, along with the department chair, is to communicate clearly in writing to faculty the expectations of the CBA with regard to each review process.

It is the responsibility of the dean to provide faculty with annual time frames for the pre-tenure review, annual report, tenure, and promotion processes.

It is the responsibility of the dean to see that the manner in which chairs evaluate faculty in each review process is consistent and fair across all departments.

The dean is to follow the procedure for review of annual reports as outlined earlier. The dean's office will plan and implement appropriate faculty development activities, based on input from the faculty. The content of these programs will address common issues expressed in the individual faculty development plans.

It is the responsibility of the dean to assist department chairs in guiding and advising individual faculty on the development of his/her student intellectual development and scholarly activity portfolio. It is particularly important that the dean provide written feedback on the quality, field appropriateness, and authorship for items in the scholarly activity portfolio. It is the responsibility of the dean to provide feedback to individual faculty with respect to academic responsibility, student intellectual development, scholarly activity and professional stewardship.

d. The CBA Personnel Committee

The Personnel Committee reviews candidates' portfolios for pre-tenure review, tenure, and promotion. The Personnel Committee does not participate in the annual review of faculty, but the candidate's annual reports and the annual reviews by the chair and dean are part of a candidate's portfolio for pre-tenure review, tenure, and promotion.

The role of the Personnel Committee in pre-tenure review, tenure, and promotion is to thoroughly evaluate each candidate's application and prepare a written report with recommendations completed within the required time frames. This report must include anonymous votes to determine if the candidate has met the criteria for academic responsibility, student intellectual development, scholarly activity, and stewardship. The report also includes the vote total from a fourth anonymous vote on the committee's overall recommendation regarding the candidate's pre-tenure review, tenure, or promotion. In addition to the vote counts and recommendation, the report should address the candidate's strengths and weaknesses. For promotion and tenure, the written recommendation is sent to the dean. For pre-tenure review the written recommendation is sent to the candidate and the candidate's chair.

3. Criteria for the Review Procedures

a. Academic Responsibility

The criteria for review procedures are structured as follows: academic responsibility, which contains three subcategories: professional development, professional responsibilities, and support of student/university services; student intellectual development, which includes two subcategories: activities directly related to the classroom and activities outside the classroom; scholarly activity, which contains two subcategories: publications/presentations and other scholarly activity; and professional stewardship, which includes three subcategories: university/college/department, discipline, and community stewardship.

Within each of the criteria sections for student intellectual development, scholarly activity, and professional stewardship, there are expectations of academic responsibility. A general statement concerning academic responsibility is stated below.

Academic responsibility spans all the traditional areas of faculty evaluation, and includes involvement of faculty in ways that support the institutional mission, maintain the functions of the University, and sustain the faculty role in shared governance. All faculty members are expected to be academically responsible to their students and peers as a baseline for service in their academic departments. Faculty members are expected to establish and maintain a consistent record of academic responsibility while at Winthrop. Academic responsibility includes, but is not limited to, three general categories: a) professional development, b) professional responsibilities, and c) support of student services.

Professional development concerns the candidate remaining current in his/her discipline and improving his/her performance in the areas of student intellectual development, scholarly activity, and professional stewardship. This can be demonstrated by the candidate engaging in professional development plans consistent with the mission and objectives of the university, college, department, and discipline, submitting thoughtful and thorough annual reports, using feedback from the annual review process to make progress toward objectives in a long-range professional development plan, and taking advantage of developmental opportunities offered by the college, the university, or outside agencies such as professional/academic organizations.

Professional development also includes participating in activities that support improvements in practice, such as participation in peer observation, attendance at professional conferences to explore current research, and engaging in sessions through Winthrop's Teaching and Learning Center. Other actions in the area of academic responsibility of professional development include maintaining credentials or certifications, using current materials, conducting pedagogical research, conducting self-directed study related to pedagogical issues, mentoring other faculty, submitting applications for outside funding, sharing expertise and results of intellectual contributions with colleagues, participating in in-house research forums, and participating in significant study to expand areas of scholarly expertise promoting cross-disciplinary experiences and/or student research.

Professional responsibilities are primarily documented through annual reviews by chairs and the dean and are considered expectations of employment. These responsibilities include adherence to academic policies (e.g., the privacy and confidentiality of student information, intellectual property and copyright, treatment of human subjects in research, final exam schedule, meeting classes at the appointed times, adhering to deadlines for grade submission, submission of midterm grades as requested) and active participation in the collection of assessment data associated with teaching and/or work assignments.

Other examples of professional responsibilities include being available to students through multiple platforms (i.e., office hours, emails, assignment feedback); engagement in faculty meetings at all levels; participation in department and college events; participation in university commencements and convocations; teaching appropriate topics as required by the CBA's current curriculum design; meeting classes at the appointed times; using class time effectively; holding adequate office hours and being available to students; using scheduled final exam times for testing or other instructional purposes; participating participate in college or university-wide curriculum revision efforts; and supporting student activities.

Additional examples of professional responsibilities include: participation in activities outside the classroom vital to the university and the CBA; providing career opportunities for students; contributing to faculty search processes; and engaging in faculty governance at all levels. With respect to attendance, faculty are expected to attend faculty meetings at all levels; attend college and university functions (such as graduations and convocations); and attend events that involve outside speakers invited by the CBA. Finally, faculty are expected to be active in at least one of either discipline or community professional stewardship. Although faculty may not report on these expectations regularly, chairs and deans will address areas of concern through meetings with individual faculty and annual evaluations.

Support of student/university services is also a part of academic responsibility. Activities in this domain include support of academic registration (i.e., formal and informal advising of students), recruitment and retention efforts, and service on committees/taskforces (i.e., membership on department, college, and university committees/taskforces).

1. Rating Scale for Evaluating Academic Responsibility

The five-point rating scale in Table 1 is provided for guidance in the evaluation of academic responsibility.

Table 1. Academic Responsibility

1 (significantly exceeds expectations)	**2 (exceeds expectations)**	***3 (meets expectations)**	**4 (performs below expectations)**	**5 (performs significantly below expectations)**
Demonstrates leadership and maturity in support of student/university services.	Has been actively and regularly engaged in a high level of support of student/university services.	Satisfies support of student/university services.	Does not fully satisfy support of student/university services.	Ignores most opportunities to support student/university services.
		Satisfies professional responsibilities.	Does not fully satisfy professional	Ignores most professional responsibilities.
Demonstrates leadership and maturity in professional development.	Has been actively and regularly engaged in a high level of professional development.	Maintains appropriate professional development.	Does not have appropriate professional development.	Ignores professional development.

* With respect to professional responsibilities the highest value is a 3.

b. Student Intellectual Development

Since Winthrop is primarily a teaching institution, a professional level of effectiveness in student intellectual development is expected from all faculty. Evidence of such effectiveness is essential for all four review processes.

Student intellectual development includes activities that are directly related to the classroom as well as relevant activities that take place outside the classroom. The former include, but are not limited to, helping students acquire disciplinary knowledge, develop critical thinking and problem solving skills, enhance interpersonal and social skills, cultivate effective communication skills, and apply knowledge and skills across contexts. In addition, using effective teaching methodology, improving courses and programs, effectively using class time, engaging students in the learning process, implementing high expectations for students, developing and using instructional materials (such as software and original course supplements), and implementing a variety of instructional practices and assessment methods are other examples. The latter include, but are not limited to, curriculum and program development, connecting instruction and program goals, curricular revisions, career counseling and student mentoring, supporting student organizations, providing field-based learning experiences, coaching students in academic competitions, leading student groups on field or international experiences, participating in goal assessment for courses and programs, and responding to observation data/evaluations of classroom performance.

With respect to activities that are directly related to the classroom, effective student intellectual development is complex and involves teaching behaviors and their impact on the student. Teaching behaviors involve the following dimensions: (a) content and instructional design, (b) course management, (c) instructional delivery, and (d) assessment (i.e., techniques, evidence and evaluation of meeting course objectives). Effective student intellectual development (within the classroom) implies that the four teaching behaviors positively impact learners. The four dimensions of teaching behaviors are described in Table 2.

Table 2. Descriptions of the four dimensions of teaching behaviors (within the classroom).

Content and	**Course Management**	**Instructional Delivery**	**Assessment**
1. Develop course content consistent with curriculum	1. Engage students in the learning process	1. Communicate ideas and knowledge effectively.	1. Develop effective measures of student learning.
2. Adjust teaching strategies based on class size, nature of the course, and variations in student	2. Be available and approachable to students.	2. Use creative and innovative methodologies and materials.	2. Provide useful feedback to students.
3. Establish and communicate appropriate course	3. Encourage students to do their best.	3. Use up-to-date topics and current information on issues relevant to the	3. Use student assessment as feedback to improve teaching.
4. Organize courses effectively.	4. Maintain an effective open and respectful learning	4. Display enthusiasm for the course and the	
5. Establish appropriate academic standards.	5. Return graded assignments in a timely fashion.		

1. Evaluating Effectiveness of Student Intellectual Development

   Because student intellectual development is both important and complex, input for the evaluation of student intellectual development is solicited from the candidate, students, peers, and administrators. The candidate evaluates effectiveness of student intellectual development through the introspection provided in a portfolio prepared for each review process. A portfolio should contain self-reflection and evidence related to the four dimensions of teaching behaviors in Table 2 as well as evidence of student intellectual development activities outside the classroom. A candidate's annual report is of particular importance. Students evaluate faculty directly through student course evaluations and indirectly through performance on assessment measures of their learning. Candidates are free to include peer evaluations of teaching behaviors and impacts on learners. Administrators (chair and dean) provide evaluations in each of the review processes.

2. Rating Scale for Evaluating Effectiveness of Student Intellectual Development

   The five-point rating scale in Table 3 is provided for guidance in the evaluation of effective student intellectual development. The numeric evaluation is not meant to be an average of rankings for different parts of the table. The numeric evaluation is meant to convey that a candidate's overall performance on student intellectual development most closely resembles a 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 as defined in Table 3. Other than Tables 4 and 5, the numeric evaluations for academic responsibility, scholarly activity, and professional stewardship are used in a similar manner. When using Table 3, evaluators should take note of differences in workloads in such areas as number of course preparations and the difficulty of courses taught.

Table 3: A five point rating scale for the evaluation of student intellectual development.

1 (significantly exceeds expectations)	**2 (exceeds expectations)**	**3 (meets expectations)**	**4 (performs below expectations)**	**5 (performs significantly below**
Excels in all four dimensions of teaching behaviors.	Excels in three of the four dimensions of teaching behaviors and is adequate in the other.	Excels in two of the four dimensions of teaching behaviors and is adequate in the other two.	There are serious deficiencies with respect to at least one dimension of teaching behaviors.	There are serious deficiencies with at least two dimensions of teaching behaviors.
Has significant positive impact on learners with respect to both student satisfaction and student learning. There is evidence that students receive an exceptional learning experience.	Has positive impact on learners with respect to both student satisfaction and student learning. There is evidence that students receive an excellent learning experience.	Has positive impact with respect to both student satisfaction and student learning. There is evidence that students receive an acceptable learning experience.	Does not have positive impact on learners with respect to both student satisfaction and student learning. There is little evidence of student learning.	Does not have positive impact on learners with respect to either student satisfaction or student learning. There is no evidence of student learning.
Seeks innovation to improve an already excellent teaching record.	Consistently strives to improve teaching effectiveness.	Often tries to improve teaching effectiveness.	Shows little interest in improving teaching effectiveness.	Shows no interest in improving teaching effectiveness.
Student evaluations are consistently in the upper range of the scale.	Student evaluations are consistently above the mid-range of the scale.	Student evaluations are in the mid-range of the scale.	Student evaluations are consistently below the mid-range of the scale.	Student evaluations are consistently in the lower range of the scale.

c. Scholarly Activity

Scholarly activity provides evidence that a candidate is active and growing in his/her discipline. Faculty engaged in such scholarly pursuits are better prepared to be stimulating forces in the classroom, contribute to the advancement of their discipline, and bring recognition to themselves and to Winthrop University. Outputs for scholarly activity include refereed journals (academic, professional, or pedagogical), research monographs, patents, scholarly books, chapters in scholarly books, textbooks, proceedings from scholarly meetings, papers presented at academic or professional meetings, publicly available research working papers, papers presented at faculty research seminars, publications in trade journals, published book reviews, in-house journals, written cases with instructional materials, and instructional software (see Table 4). Other examples of scholarly activity include, but are not limited to, application of scholarship that results in a documented change (i.e., collaboration with local schools, community organizations, new professional certifications), creation of scholarly materials and models, grant development and awards, and patent applications that require a significant investment of time.

All of these outputs may be presented as documentation of scholarly activity. Collectively these outputs comprise a portfolio of scholarly activity. The outputs in the portfolio are divided into two categories: Articles and Other. Outputs that are not in refereed journals are placed in the Other category. The CBA uses a computerized tracking system to monitor scholarly activity. In this system, refereed journal publications and conference papers are tracked separately. Additional scholarly activity is counted as other.

Articles are defined as refereed publications in the author's discipline if they appear in academic, professional, or pedagogical journals that have an acceptable refereeing process. Such a process requires that the article has been carefully reviewed and scrutinized by scholars or experts knowledgeable about the content of the article. The reviewers may be members of an editorial board or experts not associated with the editorial board. The review process should either be a blind review process where the author is not known to the reviewers or a double blind process where the author is not known to the reviewers and the reviewers are not known to the author. The manuscript is thus judged on its own merits, free from the influence of the reputation (or lack thereof) of the author. Candidates are credited with one article for one review process (e.g., a case study with a teaching note counts as one publication). Credit is given for the year the article is accepted. Refereed articles provide strong evidence of a candidate's standing in his/her academic discipline and serve as a measure of external validation.

1. Evaluation of Scholarly Activity

   Scholarly activity is evaluated on five factors: quantity, continuity, quality, field appropriateness/relevance, and authorship. Quantity and continuity are evaluated using the guidelines provided in Tables 4 and 5 below.

   Quantity and continuity. There are two quantitative measures: (a) refereed journal article productivity over a five-year period (see Table 4) and (b) total scholarly activity over a five-year period (see Table 5). With respect to continuity, faculty members should maintain a continuous history of outputs of scholarly activities. In any given five-year period, faculty should achieve at least a "meets expectations" rating with respect to the quantity of their scholarly activity in both Tables 4 and 5.

Continuity in performance is more meaningful than a short period of increased productivity.

Table 4: Refereed journal article productivity over a five-year period.	
Category	**Articles over 5 years**
1 (Significantly exceeds expectations)	5 or more articles
2 (Exceeds expectations)	4 articles
3 (Meets expectations)	3 articles
4 (Performs below expectations)	1 or 2 articles
5 (Performs significantly below expectations)	0 articles

An important linkage between Table 4 and Table 5 concerns the submission of papers to refereed journals. These submissions count in the Other category as publicly available working papers. If the submission is published in a refereed journal, then it also counts as an article in both tables. Outputs for scholarly activity are defined under the definition of scholarly activity discussed above.

Table 5. Total scholarly activity over a five-year period.	
Category	**Requirement over 5 years**
1 (Highly active)	13 or more research outputs
2 (Active)	10-12 research outputs
3 (Meets expected activity)	7-9 total research outputs
4 (Some activity)	2-6 research outputs
5 (Inactive)	Fewer than two research outputs

Quality, field appropriateness/relevance, and authorship. Evaluation of scholarly activity is more than a simple count using Tables 4 and 5. Quality, field appropriateness, and authorship are important factors in the evaluation. Faculty should document quality, field appropriateness, professional development, and authorship in the annual report. In each annual report, the dean and department chair should provide feedback on the quality, field appropriateness, professional development, and authorship of the candidate's scholarly activity. The CBA Personnel Committee will use evidence relating to these four factors from the annual report and annual review when the candidate is evaluated in pre-tenure, tenure, or promotion reviews.
For each of the categories Articles and Other, there is a qualitative dimension. The quality of an article is determined by the chair's evaluation and other factors such as the journal's reputation, a copy of the journal's refereeing procedure, letters from the journal editor, acceptance/rejection rates, citation analysis, or published rankings from field experts on the quality of the journal. Candidates for pre-tenure review, tenure, or promotion are responsible for presenting evidence of the quality of their articles.

As a candidate develops and matures, it is expected that the portfolio of scholarly activity will contain some items that are superior in quality. Additional evidence that an item is of superior quality can be demonstrated by, but is not limited to, the following: (a) the impact of an item on a community of practitioners or academics and (b) awards and prizes for scholarly activity.

In some cases, an item in the Other category can be judged to be equivalent in quality to a refereed article. One such situation can occur in fields where demands for current research results pressure faculty to publish in outlets such as conference proceedings rather than journals. If such outlets employ refereeing procedures comparable to refereed journals, then these outlets can be considered acceptable substitutes for refereed journals. Providing the documentation of quality for the review process and/or quality of the proceedings is the responsibility of the candidate. A candidate's department chair is expected to use the documentation to evaluate the scholarly activity. A written evaluation should be completed as soon as the documentation is available. The chair's written evaluation of the item should be included in the candidate's annual evaluation and/or be available for inclusion in materials used for a review of a candidate.

Candidates must also indicate the field appropriateness of scholarly activity. Specifically, there should be items in the portfolio that are clearly related to the candidate's field of expertise. The candidate's field of expertise is determined by terminal degree and/or teaching responsibilities in consultation with the dean and department chair.

With respect to one's role in co-authored journal articles, the candidate is not required to be first author, but as the candidate matures the expectation is that he/she will play an increasing role in the production of such journal articles. In cases where the position of the candidate's name on an article does not accurately reflect the candidate's role, the candidate should provide evidence regarding his/her role in the publication of the article.

2. Rating Scale for Evaluation of Scholarly Activity

   The five-point rating scale in Table 6 is provided for guidance in the evaluation of scholarly activity for the non-quantitative aspects of scholarly activity.

Table 6: A five point rating scale for the non-quantitative aspects of scholarly activity.				
1 (significantly exceeds expectations)	**2 (exceeds expectations)**	***3 (meets expectations)**	**4 (performs below expectations)**	**5 (performs significantly below expectations)**
Assumes a significant leadership role in many scholarly activities.	Often assumes a significant leadership role in scholarly activity.	Assumes a role in scholarly activity that demonstrates engagement and potential for leadership.	Demonstrates very little engagement for scholarly activity and evidence for a potential leadership role is absent.	Demonstrates no engagement in scholarly activity and no potential for a leadership role.
Evidence exists that there are several items in the scholarly activity portfolio of high quality.	Evidence exists that there is at least one item in the scholarly activity portfolio that is of high quality.	Evidence exists that there are quality inputs in the scholarly activity portfolio and there is potential for improved quality.	Evidence of quality in the scholarly activity portfolio is lacking.	There is no evidence of quality in the scholarly activity portfolio.
		The scholarly activity portfolio is field appropriate.	The scholarly activity portfolio is lacking sufficient outputs that are field appropriate.	The scholarly activity portfolio contains no outputs that are field appropriate.

* With respect to field appropriateness the highest evaluation is a 3.

d. Professional Stewardship

While the Winthrop University Faculty Manual does not differentiate among types of professional stewardship, in the CBA, professional stewardship has three dimensions: (1) university (including college and department), (2) discipline, and (3) community. CBA faculty are expected to be active in university professional stewardship and at least one of either discipline or community professional stewardship. It is acceptable to have a high level of activity in one of either discipline or community professional stewardship and a low level of activity in the other.

1. Evaluation of University Professional Stewardship

University professional stewardship includes activities conducted on behalf of the university at the university, college, or departmental level that go beyond mere participation and attendance. Leadership and/or significant time commitments can be demonstrated by, but are not limited to, the following types of activities. These types of activities are the basis for evaluating university service: holding leadership roles on committees or task forces; efforts on committees or task forces; student advising and counseling; active engagement with student organizations; efforts to increase student enrollment; efforts to improve student retention; efforts to assist with career planning for students; efforts in faculty search processes; development and participation in continuing education programs; application of faculty knowledge/expertise to support university initiatives; leadership roles in assessment initiatives; program coordination; and special administrative assignments (such as fundraising, creation of a policy manual, etc.).

Table 7 provides a five point rating scale for evaluating university professional stewardship.

Table 7: A five point rating scale for evaluation of university professional stewardship.

1 (significantly exceeds expectations)	**2 (exceeds expectations)**	**3 (meets expectation s)**	**4 (performs below expectations)**	**5 (performs significantly below**
Has demonstrated leadership and maturity by distinguishing himself/herself in multiple university service activities.	Has been actively engaged in university service functions and/or has occasionally been elected or chosen for leadership responsibilities but mostly at the college level.	Has been actively engaged in university service functions and/or served on committees/task forces, but rarely in a leadership position; however, this candidate takes university service functions seriously and makes positive contributions to the task at hand.	Has taken part in some university service functions but never in a leadership position.	Has shown an unwillingness to participate in university service functions.
Is well-known in the university and is often chosen or elected to serve in leadership positions at both the college and university level.	Is well-known and respected at the college level, but has only been in leadership positions inside the college	Is respected at the college level and has assumed leadership at the department level positions.	Is disinterested in university service functions and rarely makes positive contributions.	Seeks to avoid university service responsibilities.

2. Evaluation of Discipline Professional Stewardship

These activities are conducted primarily in settings external to the university. Typically these activities relate to faculty involvement in organizations related to the candidate's area of expertise. Candidates are expected to document their professional stewardship of their discipline. Such documentation might include, but is not limited to, copies of meeting programs including the candidate's name, letters indicative of the candidate's role, awards, or certificates. The involvement can be demonstrated by, but is not limited to, the following: holding leadership roles in national or regional professional organizations; serving as editor or reviewer for professional journals or proceedings; participation in professional meetings and seminars as a presenter, chair, or discussant; earning professional designations, honors, or awards; presenting clinics, seminars, and workshops to professional peers; serving as a professional consultant for a profession or with a for-profit organization; serving on a committee or task force for a professional organization; maintaining memberships/certifications in professional organizations; facilitation of professional development programs or continuing education programs; and management of external grant programs.

Table 8 provides a five point rating scale for evaluating discipline professional stewardship.

Table 8: A five point rating scale for evaluation of discipline professional stewardship.

1 (significantly exceeds expectations)	**2 (exceeds expectations)**	**3 (meets expectations)**	**4 (performs below expectations)**	**5 (performs significantly below**
Has demonstrated leadership and made an extensive time commitment in professional service activities supporting his/her discipline. In addition, there is evidence that the candidate's discipline professional stewardship with respect to leadership or time commitment has been of substantial benefit.	Has repeatedly committed time to discipline professional stewardship activities. This might include serving on an advisory board, serving as a journal editor, holding office, or reviewing many journal articles.	Maintains membership in appropriate professional organizations, consistently attends professional meetings as a presenter, session chair, or discussant. Occasionally reviews papers for conferences or journals.	Maintains some memberships in professional organizations, but does not get involved in any discipline professional stewardship activities.	Does not maintain membership in professional organizations and does not get involved in any discipline professional stewardship activities.

3. Evaluation of Community Professional Stewardship

   Professional stewardship to the surrounding community falls within the responsibilities of a candidate and is essential to the fulfillment of the university's responsibilities. Leadership and/or significant time commitments are the basis for evaluating community professional stewardship. The scope of community professional stewardship involves activities for any of the following: the arts, business/industry, education/schools, government (local/state/federal), health/human/social services, humanities/literature/library, national/international agencies, state/regional agencies/groups, recreational/social groups, religious/church groups, or scientific groups.

Candidates are expected to document their community professional stewardship. Such documentation might include, but is not limited to, copies of meeting programs including the candidate's name, letters indicative of the candidate's role, awards, or certificates. Such professional stewardship can be demonstrated by, but is not limited to, the following: giving presentations, workshops, or demonstrations to civic or community organizations; active participation as a member of community committees, task forces, or similar groups; serving in a leadership position in civic or community organizations; serving as a professional consultant to community organizations; serving as a volunteer worker for community organizations; and assisting students' involvement in community service as part of a course requirement.

Table 9 provides a five point rating scale for evaluating community professional stewardship.

Table 9: A five point rating scale for evaluation of community professional stewardship.

1 (significantly exceeds expectations)	**2 (exceeds expectations)**	**3 (meets expectations)**	**4 (performs below expectations)**	**5 (performs significantly below**
Has assumed leadership roles in at least one civic or community organization or has volunteered significant amounts of time to community organizations. In addition, there is evidence that the candidate's involvement has been impactful or is of high quality.	Has either served in some leadership role in community organization(s) or volunteered significant amounts of time or expertise to community organizations.	Has volunteered his/her time or expertise to community organizations.	Has taken no leadership roles nor volunteered time to community organizations.	Has not participated in civic or community organizations in any manner.
Has found ways to regularly involve students in community service as part of a course requirement in most of their courses. The involvement has been quite successful.	Has involved students in community service as part of a course requirement in several of their courses.	Has involved students in community service as part of a course requirement on several occasions.	Has not involved students in community service in any course requirements.	Has not involved students in community service in any course requirements.

4. Application of the Review Criteria

a. Annual Review

For the annual review, each faculty member is evaluated using the scales described in the preceding sections. For student intellectual development and professional stewardship, these scales can be applied to the annual review with no additional explanations. For scholarly activity, it should be noted that Tables 4 and 5 are designed to evaluate performance over multi-year review periods related to pre-tenure review, tenure, and promotion. Due to such factors as lengthy journal reviewing cycles, differing research methodologies, and variations among disciplines, there may be single years when a faculty member who is making acceptable progress has no scholarly activity that count in either table. In these situations, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide evidence in the annual report that his/her research program is active, and he/she is engaged in activities that will lead to results for Tables 4 or 5. Suitable activities might include, but are not limited to, evidence of data collection, evidence of a review of the literature, attendance at research seminars, or construction of research instruments. Involvement in such activities can provide evidence for an annual report that the faculty member meets or exceeds expectations with respect to scholarly activity.

b. Pre-Tenure Review

The candidate will prepare a portfolio of materials that documents his/her accomplishments and activities in student intellectual development, scholarly activity and professional stewardship. The CBA Personnel Committee will evaluate the portfolio in the same manner as if the candidate were standing for tenure. The criteria will be applied with the understanding that the portfolio represents only a portion of the total probationary period. The mission of the CBA Personnel Committee is to provide feedback to the candidate regarding the candidate's progress toward tenure based on his/her performance to date.

c. Tenure

1. Application of Academic Responsibility Criteria

   Tenure is based upon sustained quality performance of academic responsibility in the candidate's current rank. This normally requires that the tenure candidate maintain a rating of 3 or better during the probationary period based on the scale in Table 1.

2. Application of Student Intellectual Development Criteria

   Tenure is based upon sustained quality in the effectiveness of student intellectual development in the candidate's current rank. This normally requires that the tenure candidate maintain a rating of 3 or better during the probationary period based on the scale in Table 3.

3. Application of Scholarly Activity Criteria

   Tenure is based upon sustained quality performance with respect to scholarly activity in the candidate's current rank. For tenure, a candidate normally must have a record with respect to scholarly activity that places him/her in at least category 3 in both Table 4 and Table 5. Specifically, this means that a candidate needs a minimum of three quality articles and seven to nine total research outputs. With respect to factors of quality, field appropriateness, and authorship, evaluation is based on the evidence provided by the candidate and the annual reviews by the department chair and dean. The candidate is expected to have a rating of at least 3 based on the scale in Table 6.

4. Application of Professional Stewardship Criteria

   Tenure is based upon sustained quality performance in professional stewardship in the candidate's current rank. For tenure, a candidate normally must have an appropriate record with respect to university stewardship that will achieve a rating of at least 3 based on the scale in Table 7. In addition, the candidate normally must have an appropriate record in discipline professional stewardship that will achieve a rating of at least 3 based on the scales in Table 8 or in community professional stewardship that will achieve a rating of at least 3 based on the scale in either Table 8 or Table 9.

d. Post-Tenure Review

Faculty are also evaluated on these same criteria in the post-tenure review. The post-tenure review process is described in the Winthrop University Faculty Manual.

e. Promotion

When interpreting and applying criteria for promotion, the CBA observes the following guidelines:

The cumulative record of the candidate under consideration for promotion is evaluated in the areas of academic responsibility, student intellectual development, scholarly activity, and professional stewardship. Continuity in performance is more meaningful than short periods of increased productivity.

These policies and procedures recognize that each candidate is unique with respect to his/her academic talents and accomplishments. Therefore, with respect to student intellectual development, the evaluation process examines four dimensions of teaching behaviors inside the classroom as well as activities outside the classroom that have an impact on learners. With respect to scholarly activity, candidates can make contributions that are learning and pedagogical research, contributions to practice, or discipline-based scholarship. With respect to professional stewardship candidates are expected to perform at a high level with respect to university professional stewardship, but they have the option of choosing between discipline and community professional stewardship. Therefore, the criteria for promotion are to be applied with sufficient flexibility to recognize and capitalize upon the individual strengths of candidates.

1. Application of Academic Responsibility Criteria

   The relative weight that is given to academic responsibility in determining eligibility for promotion varies according to the academic rank under consideration.

   Assistant Professor to Associate Professor: Promotion to Associate Professor is based upon sustained high quality academic responsibility performance in the rank of Assistant Professor. For promotion to the rank of Associate Professor a candidate normally must have an appropriate record of academic responsibility that will achieve a rating of at least 3 based on the scale in Table 1.

   Associate Professor to Professor: Promotion to Professor is based upon sustained high quality academic responsibility performance in the rank of Associate Professor. A candidate seeking promotion to the rank of Professor normally must have an established record of superior academic responsibility that will achieve a rating of 3 or better based on the scales in Table 1.

2. Application of Student Intellectual Development Criteria

   The relative weight that is given to student intellectual development in determining eligibility for promotion varies according to the academic rank under consideration.

   Assistant Professor to Associate Professor: Promotion to Associate Professor is based upon sustained effective performance in the rank of Assistant Professor. Only in exceptional cases will a recommendation for promotion to Associate Professor be given to a candidate who has not earned a rating of at least 3 according to the scale in Table 3.

   Associate Professor to Professor: Promotion to Professor is based upon sustained effective performance in the rank of Associate Professor. Normally a candidate who has not earned a rating of at least 3 according to the scale in Table 3 and demonstrated some of the characteristics of a rating of 2 will not be recommended for promotion to Professor.

3. Application of Scholarly Activity Criteria

   The relative weight of the quality component for scholarly activity in determining eligibility for promotion is higher for promotion to Professor than for promotion to Associate Professor. The output of scholarly activity appropriate for promotion or tenure will be set in accordance with the goals of the CBA.

   Assistant Professor to Associate Professor: Promotion to Associate Professor is based upon sustained high quality performance in the rank of Assistant Professor. For promotion to the rank of Associate Professor a candidate normally must have an appropriate record with respect to scholarly activity that yields at least a rating of 3 in Tables 4, 5, and 6. Specifically, this means that a candidate needs a minimum of three quality articles and seven to nine total research outputs. With respect to factors of quality, field appropriateness, and authorship, evaluation is based on the evidence provided by the candidate and the annual review by the department chair and dean.

Associate Professor to Professor: Promotion to Professor is based upon sustained high quality performance in the rank of Associate Professor. Superior quality of scholarly activity is a major consideration for promotion to this rank. A candidate seeking promotion to the rank of Professor normally must have an established record of superior quality in scholarly activity that yields a rating of 3 or better in Tables 4 and 5, and yields a rating of 2 on Table 6. With respect to factors of quality, field appropriateness, and authorship, evaluation is based on evidence provided by the candidate and the annual review by the department chair and dean.

4. Application of Professional Stewardship Criteria

   The relative weight that is given to professional stewardship in determining eligibility for promotion varies according to the academic rank under consideration. Because of the requirements for demonstration of maturity and leadership, the impact and extent of professional stewardship is a larger factor in promotion to Professor than for promotion to Associate Professor.
   Assistant Professor to Associate Professor: Promotion to Associate Professor is based upon sustained high quality professional stewardship performance in the rank of Assistant Professor. For promotion to the rank of Associate Professor a candidate normally must have an appropriate record of university professional stewardship that will achieve a rating of at least 3 based on the scale in Table 7. In addition, the candidate must have an appropriate record in either discipline or community professional stewardship that will achieve a rating of at least 3 based on the scales in Tables 8 or 9, respectively.

   Associate Professor to Professor: Promotion to Professor is based upon sustained high quality professional stewardship performance in the rank of Associate Professor. A candidate seeking promotion to the rank of Professor normally must have an established record of superior quality in university professional stewardship that will achieve a rating of 2 or better based on the scales in Table 7. In addition, the candidate must normally have an appropriate record in either discipline or community professional stewardship that will achieve a rating of at least 3 based on the scales in Tables 8 and 9, respectively.

Peer Review System

The faculty of the College of Business Administration is committed to improvement of student intellectual development and other aspects of faculty productivity. An important component of that improvement effort is peer review. The system consists of the following:

1. Overall system description and timetable

2. Peer Review Form for Personnel File
   This is a one page form, to be completed by reviewer, signed by both, and inserted in the personnel file. This is to verify that the review was conducted and oral and written feedback have been provided to the faculty member being reviewed.

3. Peer Review Feedback Form
   This is a report prepared by the reviewer and discussed with the faculty member being reviewed. The template is two pages but could expand as the reviewer expresses opinions and provides written feedback. The material on the form will serve as the basis of feedback. This is the written feedback referred to in the system description. It is not a part of the personnel file nor will it be given to the chair, dean, or any other persons.

4. Peer Review Data Collection Instrument
   This is a multi-page form to be used by reviewer in any way he/she deems to be helpful. It is a set of prompts to be used to collect and organize data that the reviewer might use to complete the Peer Review Feedback Form and conduct the interview. It is only a suggestion and will not be a part of the formal review process unless both the reviewer and the faculty member under review wish to use it as a basis for discussion. The Data Collection Instrument is primarily for the benefit of the reviewer but does help to clarify expectations. It is not something that is required to be given to the faculty member being reviewed. Whether it is or is not shared with the faculty member being reviewed is up to the reviewer. As with the Feedback Form, in no case will this instrument be distributed to any persons other than the reviewer and faculty member under review.

Annual Peer Review of Non-Tenured Faculty Members

In addition to the annual evaluation process, all non-tenured, tenure track faculty members will be reviewed by a peer each year in the first, second, fourth and fifth years of employment. Any CBA faculty member may elect to participate in the Peer Review Process, regardless of tenure status or type of appointment. Requests to organize a review in a given year should be made to the Department Chair.

1. In the first, second, fourth and fifth years of a faculty member’s probationary period, a faculty peer reviewer will provide feedback regarding the faculty member’s academic responsibility, student intellectual development, scholarly activity, and professional stewardship, in addition to the annual evaluation by the department chair and dean. (This schedule may be adjusted if the faculty member has received credit toward tenure based on a prior service.)

   a. The peer reviewer will be chosen by the department chair from among three recommendations made by the faculty member. The peer reviewer must be tenured at Winthrop and may be from inside or outside the faculty member’s department but must hold rank in the College of Business Administration. The peer reviewer should agree to serve for at least two years. It is recommended that the reviewer should have close interaction with the faculty member and some personnel experience at the College or University level.

   b. The faculty member and peer reviewer should meet to discuss goals and progress relevant to each of the areas to be evaluated. As part of the review, the peer reviewer should observe the faculty member’s classes and review annual reports (preliminary draft of the current year), course and scholarship materials, student evaluations, and other relevant materials.

   c. Based on observations, discussions, and reviews of the relevant materials, the peer reviewer will provide the faculty member written confidential feedback designed to suggest areas for development and self-improvement in academic responsibility, student intellectual development, scholarly activity, and professional stewardship.

d. The peer reviewer's written feedback will be shared only with the faculty member; however, the peer reviewer will provide the dean's office with a statement that the evaluation has been completed, noting that discussions, observations, and review of written materials or other activities have taken place. This notification form will be included in the faculty member's personnel file.

2. The probationary faculty member's pre-tenure review, usually in the third year of the probationary period, which includes a review by a committee of faculty peers, will substitute for this peer review.

3. In the sixth year of the probationary period (including any years for which credit toward tenure was awarded at the time of appointment), the faculty member will be considered for tenure. The tenure review includes reviews by peers external to the faculty member's department and college. In the year in which tenure review is held, that review will substitute for this peer review.

4. Faculty who are in restricted (not probationary) positions who have renewable contracts and whose responsibilities are primarily instructional may elect to receive feedback on their performance from a faculty peer, in addition to evaluations by the department chair and dean. The review can follow the same procedure as that for probationary faculty or may be limited to feedback based on the faculty member's annual report and other relevant materials. Reviewers should consider the nature of the faculty member's responsibilities, which may be more limited than those of probationary faculty members. Faculty in restricted positions do not participate in the pre-tenure or tenure review processes but will participate in this peer review every year.

Non tenure track faculty whose positions are covered by the University Administrative Review procedure will have peer evaluation done annually as part of that system.

Peer Review of Academic Responsibility

Discussions of academic responsibility should be based on the Winthrop University Faculty Manual, the Personnel Review Procedures in the College of Business Administration Faculty Manual, the annual report form, and the form used for Review of Faculty Member by Chair. The peer reviewer should evaluate the academic responsibility of the faculty member being reviewed and identify and discuss areas of strength, areas for development, and major problem areas, should any be identified. In addition to discussing overall academic responsibility, consideration should be given to professional development, professional responsibilities, and support of student services.

Peer Review of Student Intellectual Development

Discussions of student intellectual development should be based on the Winthrop University Faculty Manual, the Personnel Review Procedures in the College of Business Administration Faculty Manual, the annual report form, and the form used for Review of Faculty Member by Chair. The peer reviewer should evaluate the student intellectual development activities of the faculty member being reviewed and identify and discuss areas of strength, areas for development, and major problem areas, should any be identified. In addition to discussing overall student intellectual development, consideration should be given to activities that are directly related to the classroom as well as activities that take place outside of the classroom.

Peer Review of Scholarly Activity

Discussions of scholarly activity should be based on the Winthrop University Faculty Manual, the Personnel Review Procedures in the College of Business Administration Faculty Manual, the annual report form, and the form used for Review of Faculty Member by Chair. The peer reviewer should evaluate the scholarly activity of the faculty member being reviewed and identify and discuss areas of strength, areas for development, and major problem areas, should any be identified. In addition to discussing the quantity of outputs, consideration should be given to continuity, quality, field appropriateness/relevance, and authorship.

Peer Review of Professional Stewardship

Discussions of professional stewardship should be based on the Winthrop University Faculty Manual, the Personnel Review Procedures in the College of Business Administration Faculty Manual, the annual report form, and the form used for Review of Faculty Member by Chair. The peer reviewer should evaluate the professional stewardship of the faculty member being reviewed and identify and discuss areas of strength, areas for development, and major problem areas, should any be identified. In addition to discussing overall professional stewardship, consideration should be given to university professional stewardship, discipline professional stewardship, and community professional stewardship.

Policy for Adjunct Faculty

1. The College of Business Administration will follow the general guidelines for adjunct employees as published by the University.

2. Qualifications:
   - Must meet SACS qualifications statements
   - Must have business/organizational experience to support the degree and course being taught
   - Should meet AACSB standards for “academically” or “professionally” qualified status to teach courses

3. All adjunct faculty will submit a complete resume and transcript showing highest degree earned.

4. It is the responsibility of department chairs to propose candidates for adjunct faculty positions and collect appropriate qualifications and resume.

5. The dean will approve adjunct faculty assignments. The dean will maintain records on adjunct faculty.

6. Adjunct faculty should attend the orientation for adjunct faculty conducted by the Assistant Dean.

7. All adjunct faculty members must administer the student evaluation in all sections taught.

8. The appropriate chair will evaluate all adjunct faculty members after each semester teaching in the program. The chair should consult with the adjunct faculty member on the evaluation before a second semester assignment.

9. A copy of the course syllabus should be given to the Assistant Dean for Administration at the beginning of each semester.

Consulting and Outside Employment

The Winthrop University policy regarding outside employment for faculty members is available on the Winthrop University Policy and Procedure Repository. The Request for Approval of Consulting or Outside Employment form is available (.pdf 13kb.)

Infrastructure to Support Faculty Development

Revised June 2012

The College is dedicated to continuous improvement in student intellectual development, scholarly activity, professional stewardship and helping faculty to acquire the ability and resources required to accomplish this objective. The faculty development plan supports these efforts.

Faculty Development Plan
The purpose of the college faculty development plan is to provide initiatives that support the continual improvement in the student intellectual development, scholarly activity, and professional stewardship of faculty in the CBA, which is consistent with the life-long learning mission of the College. Specific objectives of the faculty development plan are as follows:

- to develop the knowledge and skills of faculty with respect to student intellectual development and learning;

- to develop the knowledge of faculty about student/faculty relationships;

- to develop the knowledge of faculty in curriculum development;

- to develop and support faculty with respect to scholarly activity and knowledge of their discipline and supporting disciplines (such as ethics);

- to develop and support faculty interactions with the external business community;

- to develop the knowledge of faculty about higher education in general; and

- to enhance the professional development of faculty through interaction with the community (such as state and federal government structures and non-profit organizations).

The sections below describe the resources available to support faculty professional development in the College.

University Programs

1. Teaching and Learning Center - The University's Teaching and Learning Center provides programs and services that encourage and facilitate the professional and personal development of Winthrop's personnel from the time they arrive on campus. The center offers an extensive university-wide new faculty orientation; workshops for faculty to improve teaching and research for all faculty; and teaching circles where faculty from different disciplines gather together in small groups to observe each other in the classroom and share their experiences.

2. Office of Sponsored Programs and Research – The University's Office for Sponsored Programs and Research offers faculty assistance with human subject protocols, access to information on nationally competitive grants, and university grants to fund research activities. Through the Research Council (i.e., a university committee managed by the Office of Sponsored Programs and Research), numerous university grants are available to fund research, research with a student investigator, and curriculum development.

3. Computing and Information Technology Services – The Computing and Information Technology Services division of campus offers a variety of support for faculty, such as: academic computing (which supports the instructional and research functions of the University by providing access to diverse computing resources such as servers and workstations); user support services via a help desk; technology services (such as scantron grading); programming assistance; and telecommunications services. Computing and Information Technology Services also offers opportunities for faculty to participate in training through a Technology Tuesday brown bag series.

4. Office of Online Learning and Audio Visual Services - The office of Online Learning provides system administration of the University's learning management system (i.e., Blackboard), support and training for faculty and also provides technical assistance for the online system. The office of AV Services facilitates the ad-hoc Audio/Visual set-up needs throughout campus.

5. Faculty Awards – The University also offers a variety of awards to recognize faculty contributions. These awards are as follows: Distinguished Professor (exceptional skill in teaching, significant research, high standing among professional colleagues, and service to the university); Outstanding Junior Professor (a reputation for inspired teaching, research or creative excellence, and dedication to the welfare of students); Kinard Award for Excellence in Teaching (dedication to teaching, reputation on campus for teaching, and reputation among students); Faculty/Student Life Award (significantly contributed to the quality of student life); and Graduate Faculty Award (outstanding teaching at the graduate level, and has made a significant contribution to the quality of graduate education).

6. Sabbatical Leave Program - Sabbatical leave may be granted by the President of the University to a member of the faculty who holds the rank of Associate Professor or Professor as recognition of excellent service and scholarly achievement. This leave is to be used for

further professional development, which may involve research, formal study, or other pertinent activity which might enhance the competence of the faculty member. A sabbatical leave can be granted to a faculty member who has completed not less than six years of full-time service with the University and who has had at least six years of full-time service since any previous sabbatical leave.

7. Travel - The University encourages participation in off-campus professional activities by assisting with travel expenses. Employees of the University must have advance approval for all official travel through their respective colleges and university travel authorization procedures.

College Programs

1. Teaching Loads - The College of Business Administration attempts to provide the best instruction possible by managing faculty teaching loads, where possible, to a maximum of three courses and two preparations per semester for faculty actively engaged in research. Faculty members who are not academically or professionally qualified may have their teaching load increased to four courses each semester.

2. Research Assistants – The College provides funds to hire graduate students as research assistants to support faculty. Faculty members may apply to their chair for up to five hours per week of support for one semester during the academic year. In addition, faculty can also apply for up to ten hours per week with an extra, dedicated research assistant when working on a significant research project.

3. Travel - The College of Business supports travel to encourage faculty members to serve as presenters, session chairs, discussants, and panel members at conferences, seminars, professional meetings and other settings that provide peer and public review of their work. Separate travel funds are also available for other professional development activities, such as those related to student intellectual development. Faculty apply to chairs for travel fund requests. Priority is given to new faculty, those approaching review cycles, and those requests that are tied to professional development goals specified on the annual report.

4. CBA New Faculty Orientation – New faculty are oriented to the College of Business Administration through a series of three meetings with the Assistant Dean of Professional Development. The first, conducted before classes begin, explains academic policy to the new faculty member. The second, held later in the first semester, articulates expectations with respect to academic responsibility, student intellectual development, scholarly activity, and professional stewardship and explains the various review processes in the college. A third is held in the second semester to debrief on completion of a full grading and annual review cycle. All new faculty also participate in an advisor training session conducted by the Office of Student Services.

5. Teaching Enhancement Workshops – The College offers annual workshops to enhance and improve teaching among faculty in the college. The workshops are offered in the spring semester of each academic year. Examples of recent seminars include: Harvey Brightman on Improving Teaching and Student Learning and David Vawter on Brain Compatible Instruction.

6. Research Forums – Each year, the College hosts a series of research forums to develop and support research efforts among faculty. The goal of the research forums are to broaden understanding of and collaboration between the research programs of faculty and to assist with organizing activities to improve the functioning of faculty in research.

7. Research Grants – The College has limited funds to support summer grants for research and curriculum development. "Mini-grants" to fund research projects (and other incidental expenses such as software) during the year are funded by the College. Faculty who are interested in obtaining funds to support summer research and curriculum development are to apply to the Assistant Dean of Professional Development by February 1. Applications will be reviewed by the Dean's Council and funds to be allocated according to the following priorities: Preference will be given to grant applications that focus on developing internal collaborative research teams among CBA faculty. Preference will be given to grant applications that emphasize the connection between the grant request and individual faculty goals specified as part of the annual review process. Preference will be given to grant applications that tie to the Annual Work Plan of the College of Business Administration.

8. Brown Bag Series – Each year, the College hosts a series of brown bag lunches to highlight and share teaching-related knowledge and activities among faculty. Brown bag topics include faculty externship experiences, innovative curriculum development activities, and pedagogy for online courses.

9. College Awards – The College conveys formal recognition and awards to select business faculty each year for teaching excellence, the outstanding research article published that year, and excellence in service.

10. Peer Review System – Based on a full set of procedures, forms, timetables and guidelines, a peer review system is required for non-tenured faculty. This system allows each non-tenured faculty member input into the selection of an academically qualified peer to help advise on teaching, intellectual contributions, and the service aspects of his/her performance.

11. Accreditation Programs – The College supports faculty participation in accreditation agency sponsored programs and workshops. These include AACSB workshops on assessment, advising, the continuous improvement symposium and annual meetings. The College will also support relevant training on accreditation issues as presented by CSAC/CSAM or as part of the Annual ACM Computer Science Conference.

12. Local Practitioner Organizations – The College will pay dues for faculty members to join practitioner organizations that meet locally and with sufficient frequency to provide developmental interaction for faculty. Faculty members apply to chairs who will make decisions on the relevance of such organizational memberships.

13. Five Year Development Plans – Goal sessions and developmental planning sessions are conducted annually by the department chairs, along with the annual review. With each annual review, faculty members are asked to prepare a five year development plan stating their goals and resource requirements in all areas of assigned responsibility. The five year development plans will be reviewed by the Chairs, the Assistant Dean of Professional

Development, and the Dean. Information will be collected and used to plan for resource acquisitions and allocation in the College.

14. AQ/PQ Action Plans - Chairs will meet with faculty who are not academically/professionally qualified to create action plans for improvement. Under certain circumstances, the Assistant Dean for Professional Development may also meet with faculty who are not academically/professionally qualified to suggest activities for improvement. Chairs and the Assistant Dean for Professional Development will also assign these faculty members a mentor within the college who can advise and work with the faculty member on his/her scholarly activity. In addition, summer teaching preferences will be prioritized according to academic and professional qualifications. Faculty who are ABD and/or not academically or professionally qualified may not be eligible for summer teaching.

Procedures and Criteria for Search Committees

Procedures for Search Committees

Departments should follow the procedures published as "Faculty Recruitment Procedures" distributed by Academic Affairs. The CBA adaptation is available in the dean's office. The information below reflects expectations about search committee procedures within the College of Business Administration. This procedure will be followed to the extent practical in a given search. Late and unexpected vacancies may require the process be expedited in some cases.

Formation and Guiding Principles:

The department chair will consult with the Dean's Council on the composition of a Search Committee. The Dean's council will make internal decisions on position allocations after reviewing the various program improvement plans and other descriptions of needs. Requests for positions must be approved by the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Chairs will collect faculty input in developing position requests.

The department chair, working with the appropriate administrative assistant will manage the appropriate paperwork. This is an administrative function and is not the responsibility of the Search committee.

Search committees should be made up of departmental/disciplinary faculty and at least one faculty member from a related department or discipline inside the College. Search Committees for department chairs should include a department chair from a related department outside the College if possible. Search committees, departments or department chairs should meet with the dean before initiating their activities as part of a search to determine priorities, criteria, and expectations for the candidate. Activities of the dean, chair, and search committees will be guided by the CBA mission statement and staffing plan.

Before position approval, department chair will consult with departmental faculty and:

1) Complete "Request for Faculty Position" (Exhibit A) and "Memorandum for Routing Unclassified Vacancy Notices".

2) Develop a position announcement, which will also be used as the basis for advertisements. This is a critical function in that it limits variables on which on final selection decision can be based. When identifying preferences, be careful with overly prescriptive disciplines and sub-specialty lists.

3) Develop a brief justification statement for replacement positions, including salary range. Request for new positions will require more extensive statements of justification.

   After the position has been approved, department chair and search committee will submit to the dean:

4) A recruitment plan and preliminary schedule, to include:
   a) members of the search committee
   b) a list of "Criteria for Search Committee to use in Selection" modified as appropriate to this position
   c) location, schedule and number of advertisements
   d) other activities by committee members to ensure a qualified pool of applicants (including web page posting)
   e) additional advertisements or activities to ensure an appropriate number of applicants from groups underrepresented in the discipline or the faculty as a whole; this can include use of HRAA's standard mailing list of historically black institutions

5) A selection plan, to include:
   a) procedures for maintaining and acknowledging applications
   b) procedures for screening applications
   c) plans and schedule for preliminary interviews at disciplinary conferences or through conference calls
   d) when pool is reduced to approximately 10-15 candidates, department chair and dean should be briefed on progress

6) A plan for interviewing finalists, to include:
   a) procedures for calling listed or unlisted references
   b) plans and schedules for bringing finalists (2 candidates) to campus for interviews
   c) target date for appointing successful candidate
   d) department chair will conduct a telephone interview with top 5 candidates
   e) dean will be briefed by search committee or department chair on progress of search

When candidates have been selected for interviews:

1) Complete Applicant Referral Grids I and II including information on all candidates, whether or not they are to be interviewed. When completing the grids, refer to the specific position announcement and advertisements and the general variable identified below as "Criteria for Search Committee to Use in Evaluation of Candidate Material."

2) When Search Committees are down to a list of about 5 finalists, they should share that list with the dean and department chair. From that point forward, the department chair should be actively involved in the selection of 2 finalists to invite for a visit. The dean should be consulted on that choice. When the 2 on campus finalists are selected, the department chair

assumes responsibility for all arrangements of the details of the visit. Faculty serve only occasionally on search committees and the management of the visit is critical, both to College's ability to evaluate candidates and to the University legal position. Department chairs are much more familiar with the process and can work closely with the appropriate administrative assistant to insure the standard visit protocol is followed. Search committee members are to be consulted during the process and are to play an active role in the visit itself but the administrative responsibility and management function is for the department chair.

Details are specified below but general parameters for the visit are:
Must have a meeting with Vice President of Academic Affairs Must meet with the dean, at the end of the daily schedule
Make a research presentation to the faculty
Make sure time is allowed for transit for one visit location to another
Make sure someone is provided to escort the candidate from place to place Make sure the candidate has broad exposure to other faculty members in the Department and College
Separate time with Department Chair
Group time with other chairs
Time with other administrators such as an Assistant Dean, Graduate Director, Director of Student Services, Director of External Relations
Building and facilities tour
Optional
In class or at least presentation to students
Campus tour
Tour around Rock Hill and surrounding area, real estate agent Required interaction with hiring liaison administrative assistant Submit receipts for all expenses incurred in travels
Submit signed authorization to conduct background check

3) Provide a folder for each candidate to be interviewed containing:
   a) letter of application
   b) c.v. or resume
   c) official transcript (it is essential that an official transcript be received by the time of the visit)
   d) letters of reference (if requested)
   e) evidence of effective teaching
   f) application forms
   g) cover sheet requesting permission to interview

4) Schedule interviews with the dean and vice president for academic affairs for candidates for probationary appointments or candidates for term contracts; schedule interviews with the dean for restricted positions.

5) The visit as planned by the Department Chair is required to introduce the candidates to a broad range of College faculty and collecting faculty opinions.

6) Candidates should make a research presentation and have some contact with students. Both the research presentation and student interaction can be accomplished in a single presentation. If this is not possible, separate sessions should be scheduled. Normally, this should involve teaching a class.

7) Reactions should be collected from all participants in the visit and interview.

8) After all interviews have been completed, the search committee will name acceptable candidates.

9) The dean and department chair will confer with the chair of the search committee (if other than the department chair).

10) Follow guidelines for recruitment expenses and have the candidates work with administrative staff to complete the proper documentation for the candidate to be reimbursed for actual travel expenses incurred. Remind them that receipts are required.

11) The dean will assume responsibility for all communication with candidates after on campus interviews and visits are completed. He or she will make the verbal offer after managing all the process paperwork and obtaining the required approvals. The department chair will manage communication with the pool of applicants not selected for an interview.

12) The dean's office manages the process after the visit and through the actual hiring process.

When a candidate has been selected:

1) The committee and department chair will provide the dean folders for candidates who have been interviewed, including completed cover sheets. The dean's office manages the required archives.

2) A conditional verbal offer will be extended by the dean. If the offer is accepted, a written letter of offer will be sent by the president's office.

3) Department chair will manage the change in the referral Grid I if initial list of candidates interviewed does not yield a successful hired candidate and further applicants must be screened. This may include consideration of late applicants and those with major changes in status (dissertation defense, article acceptance, etc) since original screening was done.

4) Establish an immediate connection with a faculty mentor. When an acceptable candidate has not been identified:

    The dean and department chair will confer on the next step. Options include; going into the non interviewed finalist pool and bring in additional candidates from the original pool of applicants, or, reopening the search and accepting other applicants with a new "Review/close" date, or, declaring the current search failed and reopen a new search under different requirements or postpone until another recruiting style.

Revised 5/97, 10/97, 4/98, 5/98, 9/98, 2/10, 2/12.

Criteria for search committees to use in evaluation of candidate material:

The list below is to be considered as a starting point for all search committees in reducing the applicant pool. All selections must consider the requirements of the college mission statement and the staffing plan. The list was primarily designed for appointment at the Assistant rank and may be modified for other ranks.

Criterion to satisfy.... exact order, priority, and weighting to be established for each search by search committee in consultation with department chair and dean. The committee should always consider the most recent statement of the Mission of the College of Business Administration and correspondence between the diversity of the faculty and the student population.

1. must provide evidence/potential of ability as a good teacher, able to relate to students in and out of the classroom and have some record of doing so or strong indication of potential.

2. must have a field specific Ph.D. degree or very close to completion-ABD. The business Ph.D. should be from an accredited business school. For computer science and other non-business school related candidates, quality of the program and Ph.D. granting institution should be considered in some objective way. When possible, consider faculty with whom candidates have studied or done research. This is the academic qualification and cannot be someone cross trained or who is trained in one area and does research in another unless the research record is outstanding. ABD candidates who are not finished when contract period starts will be considered for appointment to a non-tenure track position with a reduction in compensation. Candidates considered for status as "professionally qualified" should be evaluated very carefully and in consultation with the dean.

3. must have research record, show research orientation as a graduate student or at least show strong evidence of potential (Look at dissertation topic for recent Ph.D.s). The candidate must meet all accreditation requirements for faculty credentials. The committee will seek balance of candidate's record with department activity. This balance will be on topics as well as type of research considering basic, applied, and instructional categories. The candidate's fit with the overall College's research portfolio will also be considered.

4. should have a specialty that is complementary to other members of the department and one that is required in our current programs or one that is in development, should be experienced in teaching in that specialty (Look at dissertation topic). Search committee must identify at beginning what the desired specialty is in that search.

5. should have second teaching field that is complementary to departmental needs (current and/or future), especially flexibility as the department's offerings evolve.

6. should have practical business experience, the more closely related to teaching area, the more valuable.

7. should have the skills, experience, and interest needed to relate to the professional community in the field (not dated, willing to develop internship opportunities, help with placement, etc).

8. should closely examine the candidates international experience or perspectives on international business; balance of such perspectives (world wide coverage, regional specialization, specific industry expertise etc.) should be a factor in selection.

9. would be helpful to know programs and accreditation requirements.

In consultation with the dean and chair, the search committees may add to, modify, or reorder this list at the beginning of the search. It must be done so as to inform the potential applicants as soon as they apply. This list will be the basis for completing the Applicant Referral Grids.