

# **Personnel Policies and Procedures**

## **College of Business Administration Winthrop University**

**Post June 2022 Edition**

# Contents

---

1. Overview	1
1.1 Application of these Guidelines	
1.2 Creation of the Portfolio	
1.3 Responsibilities of the Persons Involved in Reviews	
1.4 Definition of Ranks	
2. Process for Determining Faculty Qualifications Status	
2.1 Rationale	
2.2 Principles and Process	
2.3 Definitions	
2.4 Scholarly Academic	
2.5 Practicing Academic	
2.6 Scholarly Practitioner	
2.7 Instructional Practitioner	
2.8 Authority	
2.9 Documentation	
2.10 Guidelines for Determining Participating and Supporting Faculty	
3. Personnel Review	
3.1 The Review Processes	
3.1.1 Annual Review Process	
3.1.2 Pre-Tenure Review Process	
3.1.3 Tenure Process	
3.1.4 Post Tenure Process	
3.1.5 Promotion Process	
3.2 Criteria for Review	
3.2.1 Academic Responsibility	
3.2.2 Student Intellectual Development	
3.2.3 Scholarly Activity	
3.2.4 Committees and Other Professional Activities (i.e., service)	
3.3 Application of the Review Criteria	
3.3.1 Annual Review	
3.3.2 Pre-Tenure Review	
3.3.3 Tenure	
3.3.4 Post Tenure Review	
3.3.5 Promotion	
4. Peer Review System	
4.1 Peer Review of Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty	
4.2 Peer Review of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty	
4.3 Areas for Peer Review	
5. Policy for Adjunct Faculty	
6. Consulting and Outside Employment	

# **1. Overview**

---

## **1.1 Application of these Guidelines**

This edition, titled *Post June 2022 Edition*, applies to all evaluations and personnel decisions for faculty members hired June 2022 or later. Faculty hired before this date may elect to use these guidelines. This edition will also apply to all personnel decisions beginning in Academic Year 2027-2028.

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.

## **1.2 Creation of the Portfolio Supporting a Faculty Member's Application for Promotion or Tenure**

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

In the preparation of the portfolio for promotion or for tenure, the Winthrop University guidelines would benefit 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.

## **1.3 Responsibilities of Persons Involved in Reviews**

### **1.3.1 The Faculty Member**

For each review process, it is the responsibility of faculty to provide appropriate evidence of performance and activities relevant to the review process. Faculty must understand the importance of providing such supporting materials. For example, faculty must provide evidence on quality and quantity, and the faculty member must provide written comments on the impact, field appropriateness/relevance, and authorship of each scholarly activity accepted or published during the review period.

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). Chairs' in-person review meetings with faculty members are to be completed by April 15.

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.

### **1.3.2 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.

The department chair is to follow the procedures for all reviews as outlined in sections 3.1. and 5.

The department chair should appoint a Peer Reviewer for all new tenure-track faculty. See Section 4.

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 is integral to this process. In addition to mentoring and evaluation, the chair will also suggest appropriate faculty development activities for student intellectual development, scholarly activity, and committees and other professional activities.

In offering faculty development 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, professional, and community service obligations, and involvement with student activities outside of the classroom.

When a faculty member is a candidate for reappointment, pre-tenure review, promotion or tenure, 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, including a clear statement of the level of support the chair provides the candidate.

### **1.3.3 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 reappointment, pre-tenure review, tenure, and promotion processes.

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

The dean's office will plan and implement appropriate faculty development activities, based on input from the faculty and their chairs. 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, service, scholarly activity, and academic responsibility. It is particularly important that the dean provide written

feedback on the quality, quantity, continuity, field appropriateness, and authorship for items in the scholarly activity portfolio.

### 1.3.4 The College of Business Administration Personnel 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.

The role of the Personnel Committee in reappointment, pre-tenure , tenure, and promotion reviews 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 student intellectual development, scholarly activity, and service (including academic responsibility within each of the three criteria). The report also includes the vote total on the committee's overall recommendation regarding the candidate's reappointment, pre-tenure review, tenure, or promotion. In addition to those four 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, and subsequently forwarded to the candidate. For pre-tenure and reappointment reviews, the written recommendation is sent to the candidate, the candidate's chair, and the Dean.

## 1.4 Definitions of Ranks

Faculty at each rank are expected to maintain at least a level of performance consistent with the requirements for promotion to that rank. The university policy on rank can be found here: (<https://apps.winthrop.edu/policyrepository/Policy/FullPolicy?PID=289>).

**Contingent Appointments:** Instructors, Senior Instructors, and Adjuncts are 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 committees and other professional activities, 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, provided that the individual meets the criteria consistent with the higher rank based on a reappointment review following the process established in Section 5.

**Assistant Professor:** An 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 committees and other

professional activities (including academic responsibility within each) that can lead to tenure or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

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.

**Associate Professor:** An Associate Professor, a senior rank in the faculty, normally is required to have an earned ~~accredited~~ 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. He/She must demonstrate a high level of performance in student intellectual development, scholarly activity, and service on committees and other professional activities, including academic responsibility within each. In addition, an Associate Professor is expected to demonstrate a high level of service in either the community or discipline committees, and other professional activities categories.

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.

**Professor:** A 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. Professors are expected to maintain a high level of performance in student intellectual development, scholarly activity, and service on university committees and other professional activities, including academic responsibility within each. In addition, they must demonstrate a high level of service in either the community or discipline committees and other professional activity. Professors must demonstrate 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.

In making recommendations for promotion to professor, evidence to meet the student intellectual development and service criteria is not limited to these minimum time frames. Accumulated evidence of performance and productivity from outside the time frame is relevant in promotion deliberations. While tenure is based on the specific probationary period, promotion is generally more often earned over a career rather than from efforts in any prescribed time period.

## **2. Process for Determining Faculty Qualification Status**

---

### **2.1 Rationale**

AACSB, SACSCOC 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 CBA Faculty 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:

“Faculty qualifications status refers to one of four categories designated to demonstrate current and relevant intellectual capital or professional engagement in the area of teaching to support the school’s mission and related activities. Categories for specifying faculty qualifications are based on both the initial academic preparation or professional experience, and sustained academic and professional engagement within the area of teaching...” (AACSB 2020 Standards, Standard 3).

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/or discipline -based scholarship.

### **2.2 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 Credentials Committee. 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.

### **2.3 Definitions**

According to the AACSB 2020 Standards, Standard 3: Faculty and Professional staff Resources, “Faculty members can be Scholarly Academic (SA), Practice Academic (PA), Scholarly Practitioner (SP), or Instructional Practitioner (IP). Faculty members should be assigned one of these designations based on the school’s criteria for initial qualifications and sustained

engagement activities that support currency and relevancy in the teaching field. Faculty whose qualifications do not meet the criteria established by the school for SA, PA, SP, or IP status will be classified as “Additional” Faculty. [...]

**Scholarly Academics (SA)** are faculty who have normally attained a terminal degree in a field related to the area of teaching and who sustain currency and relevancy through scholarship and activities related to the field of teaching.

**Practice Academics (PA)** are faculty who have normally attained a terminal degree in a field related to the area of teaching and who sustain currency and relevancy through professional engagement, interaction, and activities related to the field of teaching.

**Scholarly Practitioners (SP)** are faculty who have normally attained a master’s degree related to the field of teaching; have professional experience substantial in duration and responsibility at the time of hire; and who sustain currency and relevancy through scholarship related to their professional background and experience in their field of teaching.

**Instructional Practitioners (IP)** are faculty who have normally attained a master’s degree related to the field of teaching; have professional experience substantial in duration and responsibility at the time of hire; and who sustain currency and relevancy through continued professional experience and engagement related to their professional background and experience in their field of teaching.

**Additional Faculty (A)** are faculty who do not meet the school’s criteria for SA, PA, SP, or IP.

**Figure 1: Model for Faculty Qualifications**

		Sustained engagement activities	
		Academic (Research/Scholarly)	Applied/Practice
Initial academic preparation and professional experience	Terminal degree	Scholarly Academics (SA)	Practice Academics (PA)
	Master’s degree; professional experience, substantial in duration and level of responsibility	Scholarly Practitioners (SP)	Instructional Practitioners (IP)

## 2.4 Qualification Status: Scholarly Academic

### 2.4.1 Initial Academic Preparation for Scholarly 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.

## **2.4.2 Sustained Qualifications for Scholarly Academic**

Qualification as a Scholarly Academic is maintained by publishing three or more Type I, II, or III quality refereed journal articles, or two Type I, II or III quality refereed journal articles and one 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 on Table 4 on 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 committees and other professional activities in the Annual 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 4 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 the primary field. 9. Authorship of a peer reviewed, proceedings publication (or equivalent). 10. Authorship of a research monograph, book, chapter in a book, peer-reviewed paper presentation, faculty research seminar, or non-peer reviewed journal article.

## **2.5 Qualification Status: Practice Academic**

### **2.5.1 Initial Academic Preparation for 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.

### **2.5.2 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 ensure 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, active engagement and/or leadership 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 the Credentials 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, AP or other 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. 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).

## **2.6 Qualification Status: Scholarly Practitioner**

### **2.6.1 Initial Professional Experience for Scholarly Practitioner**

Those faculty hired without a terminal degree but with significant professional experience can also be qualified as Scholarly Practitioners. Scholarly 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 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 Credentials Committee, consisting of the Dean, Department Chairs, the appropriate Assistant or Associate Dean, and a representative from the faculty. Chairs are responsible for collecting candidate material, comparing resumé content to the standards, and making the original case. Then, the Credentials 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.

### **2.6.2 Sustained Qualifications for Scholarly Practitioners**

Qualification as a Scholarly Practitioner is maintained by publishing 3 or more refereed journal articles, or 2 refereed journal articles (Type I, II, III, or IV) 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 4 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 SACSCOC, 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 (or equivalent), proceedings publication. 10. Authorship of a research monograph, book, chapter in a book, peer-reviewed paper presentation, faculty research seminar, or non-peer reviewed journal article.

## **2.7 Qualification Status: Instructional Practitioner**

### **2.7.1 Initial Professional Experience for Instructional Practitioner**

Those faculty hired without a terminal degree but with significant professional experience can also be qualified as Instructional Practitioners. 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 an Instructional Practitioner the candidate must have/ have had 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.

### **2.7.2 Sustained Qualifications for 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 ensure 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 the Credentials 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).

## **2.8 Authority**

For initial full time appointments, the decision on a faculty member's status will be made as a recommendation from the Search Committee with final authority resting with the CBA Dean. Decisions will be reconfirmed each year as part of the Annual Review Process.

For the part time appointment, the decision on a faculty member's qualification status will be made by the CBA Credentials Committee and the Dean. For appointments after the first semester, the status will be reviewed and confirmed by the CBA Credentials Committee each semester of employment.

## **2.9 Documentation**

The following documentation will be completed by the appropriate administrative officer 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 appropriate administrative officer 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 upon request.

## **2.10 Guidelines for Determining Participating and Supporting Faculty**

Standard 3: Faculty and Professional Staff Resources of the AACSB 2020 Standards requires that: “The school maintains and strategically deploys sufficient participating and supporting faculty who collectively demonstrate significant academic and professional engagement that, in turn, supports high-quality outcomes consistent with the school’s mission.”

With respect to faculty sufficiency, AACSB Standard 3.1 requires that “A school adopts and applies criteria for documenting faculty members as "participating" or "supporting" that are consistent with its mission. Each school should adapt this guidance to its particular situation and mission by developing and implementing criteria that indicate how the school is meeting the spirit and intent of the standard. The criteria should address the activities that are required to attain participating and supporting status and the depth and breadth of activities expected within a typical AACSB accreditation review cycle to maintain participating and supporting status. The criteria should be periodically reviewed and reflect a focus on continuous improvement. Normally, participating faculty members will deliver at least 75 percent of the school's teaching globally (i.e., across the entire accredited unit); participating faculty members will deliver at least 60 percent of the teaching within each discipline.”

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 organized 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.

### **3. Personnel Review**

---

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, including section 5 below. Faculty are evaluated on criteria that measure academic responsibility, student intellectual development, scholarly activity, and committees and other professional activities (i.e., what was traditionally called service). Non-tenure-track faculty are evaluated with the same criteria, except scholarly activity is evaluated differently (see section 5 below).

The criteria are applied in five review processes: 1) annual review, 2) pre-tenure review, 3) tenure, 4) promotion, and 5) post-tenure review.

The following sections contain descriptions of:

- 3.1 the five review processes;
- 3.2 the criteria for academic responsibility, student intellectual development, scholarly activity, and committees and other professional activities; and
- 3.3 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 committees and other professional activities. Since academic responsibility spans all areas of evaluation and consists of the baseline requirements in the respective domains, it is already encompassed within the 60, 25, and 15 percent allocations.

#### **3.1 The Review Processes**

##### **3.1.1 Annual Review Process**

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, 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 committees and other professional activities for the spring, summer, and fall semesters of the previous calendar year (January 1 – December 31). 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 three-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 three-year development plans.

### **3.1.2 Pre-Tenure Review Process**

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.

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 documentation 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 candidate requests the review. 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 Dean's Office informs the candidate of the schedule for the pre-tenure review and provides information on the criteria and recommended documentation for tenure. The Dean's Office provides notice to the CBA Personnel Committee of those candidates subject to pre-tenure review in that year.
2. The candidate prepares a portfolio for the committee following the format for tenure review. See Appendix A for a checklist of materials to go in the portfolio. The material submitted should follow the criteria described in Section 3.2. The language of these criteria 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 to be appropriate and supportive of the evaluation process.
3. The college personnel 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 copies of the report to the department chair and dean. As noted in section 1.3.4, the committee should include vote totals in their letter.

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 provides a written statement to the candidate.

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 15	Department chairs notify candidates that the pre-tenure review will be conducted. The dean provides notice to the CBA Personnel Committee of the candidates to be reviewed that year.
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 dean.

### 3.1.3 Tenure Process

Each year the university's chief academic officer publishes a timetable for the tenure process. The candidate's portfolio is generally due September 1. By June 1 of the prior academic year, candidates must submit to the CBA Dean's Office an application form for tenure and/or promotion.

The time period for tenure review is five years.

Normally, during the fall of the sixth year of a candidate's probationary appointment, including any credit given for prior service, the candidate prepares a tenure portfolio according to the guidelines of the CBA (see Appendix A for the Portfolio contents checklist). Note, like pre-tenure review, tenure candidates who were hired with credit for tenure must provide documentation accounting for the work that occurred in the years of credit that accrued while employed at another institution. The Dean will notify the candidate of this requirement at the

time of hire. The portfolio 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.

In accordance with the tenure and promotion guidelines set forth by the university, the chair may request additional materials from the candidate be added to the portfolio prior to sending on to the University Personnel Committee.

### **3.1.4 Post-Tenure Review Process**

For post-tenure review, faculty are evaluated on the criteria required to meet tenure. The post-tenure review process is described in the Winthrop University Faculty Manual.

### **3.1.5 Promotion Process**

The minimum time for promotion to Associate Professor is typically six years including any credit given for prior service; however, candidates with exceptional qualifications may apply for early promotion. Specifically, candidates who demonstrate sustained exceptional performance (exceeding, or significantly exceeding expectations) in the areas of teaching, research, and service may apply for early promotion pending they (1) address the results of pre-tenure review if one was required, and (2) provide justification for their application for early promotion, demonstrating their exceptional performance.

The timetable for Promotion is similar, but slightly different, from the timetable for Tenure. As with Tenure, the CBA follows the timetable published by the university's chief academic officer. Portfolios are generally due on September 1.

Note that candidates for Promotion must complete an Application form in the CBA Dean's Office by June 1, prior to the fall semester they plan to submit their portfolio. This includes candidates for tenure.

As with Tenure, the portfolio is prepared following CBA and University guidelines. The portfolio is first submitted to the department chair, then the college Personnel Committee. 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 chief academic officer. If the Dean's recommendation is negative, ~~no materials are submitted to the chief academic officer~~ it is the decision of the candidate as to whether the portfolio will be sent to the chief academic officer. In such a case, the candidate is provided a ~~oral~~ written summary by the Dean of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses identified in the review process.

Once the candidate submits the portfolio to the department chair no material can be deleted from the portfolio. Materials can be added by the candidate upon request from the department chair.

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.**

## **3.2 Criteria for Review**

The following four factors are examined in each review process:

1. Academic Responsibility section 3.2.1
2. Student Intellectual Development section 3.2.2
3. Scholarly Activity section 3.2.3
4. Committees/ Professional Activities section 3.2.4

Section 3.3 specifies how each of these four criteria are applied in Annual Evaluations, Pre-tenure Reviews, Promotion, Tenure, and Post-Tenure reviews.

### **3.2.1 Academic Responsibility**

Within each of the criteria sections for student intellectual development, scholarly activity, and committees and other professional activities, there are expectations of academic responsibility. Below is a general statement concerning academic responsibility.

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 committees and other professional activities. 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 development for teaching. 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 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 guidance 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 discipline, community, or professional service.

Support of student 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).

The five-point rating scale in Table 1 is provided for guidance in the evaluation of academic responsibility for annual evaluations, tenure decisions, promotion decisions, and post-tenure review, as described in detail in Section 3.4.

**Table 1**  
**Performance Expectations for Academic Responsibility**

<b>1 - Significantly Exceeds Expectations</b>	<b>2 - Exceeds Expectations</b>	<b>3 - Meets Expectations</b>	<b>4 - Below Expectations</b>	<b>5 - Significantly Below Expectations</b>
Is extremely active and highly engaged (Demonstrates leadership and maturity) in support of	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.

student/university services.				
		Satisfies professional responsibilities.	Does not fully satisfy professional responsibilities.	Ignores most professional responsibilities.
Is extremely active and highly engaged (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 engage in appropriate professional development.	Ignores professional development.

### 3.2.2 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 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.

#### 3.2.2.1 Dimensions of Student Intellectual Development

Effective student intellectual development is complex and involves teaching behaviors and their impact on the students, the business community, academics, or the university. Teaching behaviors that are directly related to the classroom involve the following dimensions:

- 1) content and instructional design,
- 2) course management,
- 3) instructional delivery,
- 4) assessment (i.e., evidence and evaluation of meeting course objectives), and
- 5) teaching development activities.

Examples of appropriate activities in each of these dimensions are described below.

### Content and Instructional Design

- Develop course content consistent with curriculum goals of the CBA.
- Adjust teaching strategies based on class size, nature of the course, and variations in student preparation.
- Establish and communicate appropriate course expectations.
- Organize courses effectively.
- Establish appropriate academic standards.

### Course Management

- Engage students in the learning process.
- Be available and approachable to students.
- Encourage students to do their best.
- Maintain an effective open and respectful learning environment.
- Return graded assignments in a timely fashion.

### Instructional Delivery

- Communicate ideas and knowledge effectively.
- Use creative and innovative methodologies and materials.
- Use up-to-date topics and current information on issues relevant to the discipline.
- Display enthusiasm for the course and the discipline.

### Assessment

- Develop effective measures of student learning.
- Provide useful feedback to students.
- Use student assessment as feedback to improve teaching.

### **3.2.2.2 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 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 will prepare a "teaching portfolio" that communicates their accomplishments in the area of student intellectual development. The portfolio can include peer evaluations of teaching behaviors, sample assignments or projects, unsolicited comments from students, and anything else that demonstrates impacts on learners. This is in addition to student evaluation data. Administrators (chair and dean) provide evaluations in each of the review processes.

Each faculty member's overall teaching effectiveness is rated each year by the department chair using the following rubric. Expectations for tenure and promotion are specified in Section 3.3 Application of Criteria.

### **Table 2**

## Performance Expectations for Student Intellectual Development.

1 - Significantly Exceeds Expectations	2 - Exceeds Expectations	3 - Meets Expectations	4 - Below Expectations	5 - Significantly Below Expectations
Excels in all dimensions of SID as evidenced by the teaching portfolio (combination of teaching evaluations, peer-reviews, student samples, feedback, and other forms of documentation)	Excels in three of the dimensions of SID and is adequate in the other one as evidenced by the teaching portfolio (combination of teaching evaluations, peer-reviews, student samples, feedback, and other forms of documentation)	Excels in two of the dimensions of SID and is adequate in the other two as evidenced by the teaching portfolio (combination of teaching evaluations, peer-reviews, student samples, feedback, and other forms of documentation)	Is at least adequate in three of the dimensions of SID and there are serious deficiencies with respect to at least one dimension as evidenced by the teaching portfolio (combination of teaching evaluations, peer-reviews, student samples, feedback, and other forms of documentation.)	Is at least adequate in two of the dimensions of SID and there are serious deficiencies with the other two dimensions as evidenced by the teaching portfolio (combination of teaching evaluations, peer-reviews, student samples, feedback, and other forms of documentation)
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 student satisfaction. 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 by addressing student feedback and/or assessment results	Often tries to improve teaching effectiveness by addressing student feedback and/or assessment results	Shows little interest in improving teaching effectiveness. Does not comment on student feedback and/or assessment results.	Shows no interest in improving teaching effectiveness. Disregards student feedback and/or assessment results.

### 3.2.3 Scholarly Activity

All tenured and tenure-track faculty are expected to conduct research and produce scholarly works for publication. Non-tenure-track faculty should work with their department chair to determine a plan for maintaining their qualifications for teaching. As described in Section 2, those activities might or might not include conducting research and publishing articles.

Scholarly activity provides evidence that a faculty member 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, instructional software, 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.

Peer Reviewed Journal Articles (PRJs) 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 and are indexed by a scholarly bibliographic database. The review 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 or a double blind process. The manuscript is thus judged on its own merits, free from the influence of the reputation of the author.

In some situations, a scholarly work might be considered equivalent to a PRJ. For example, some conference proceedings are considered the premier publication for their area of knowledge. PRJ equivalency is determined by meeting the quality criteria in Table 3. Faculty who seek an exception to the quality standards in Table 3 may submit their publication or conference proceeding for evaluation by the credentials committee. This evidence can be submitted any time of the year, but determination must be completed before the work will be considered for Annual Review, Tenure, or Promotion. Faculty must provide the committee with ample evidence of publication quality, acceptance rates, the review process, and other evidence of the prestige and quality of the publication. This same evidence must appear in applications for tenure and/or promotion.

Faculty are credited with one article for one review process (e.g., a case study with a teaching note counts as one publication). For purposes of the annual evaluation, credit is given for the year the article is accepted. For purposes of tenure and promotion, credit is given for the year the article is accepted or published. Articles accepted and counted in the portfolio submitted for promotion to associate may not be counted in the 5-year window when submitting an application for promotion to full professor.

Final copies of all scholarly work must be uploaded into CBA's computerized tracking system. Evidence of quality must also be provided by the faculty member. This evidence might include the Cabell's listing, ratings from ABDC or CORE/ERA, reviews of the work, or a letter from the CBA Credentials Committee. All dimensions of scholarly work (see section 3.2.3.1) should be addressed by the candidate, including impact on the candidate's teaching.

### **3.2.3.1 Dimensions of Scholarly Activity**

Scholarly activity is evaluated on six dimensions: quality, quantity, continuity, impact, field appropriateness/relevance, and authorship. Quantity and continuity are quantitative measures. Quality, impact, field appropriateness/relevance, and authorship are more qualitative factors.



## Quality

All scholarly works are classified as Type I, II, III, IV, or V. Point values for each type are used in decisions on promotion, tenure, and faculty qualification status. Table 3 provides guidelines for how scholarly works will be classified. Specifically, quality is assessed by meeting criteria in one of the columns listed in Table 3 (either Acceptance rate, Cabell's Difficulty, ABDC, or Computer Science Scholarship Criteria, but not all of the above). Faculty who seek an exception to the quality standards in Table 3 may submit their publication or conference proceeding for evaluation by the credentials committee, along with ample evidence to justify the exception being requested. Appeals to the credentials committee may be made before or after the work is submitted for publication. Justification for appeals must also be included in the portfolio for tenure or promotion.

**Table 3**  
**Guidelines for Evaluating Research Quality**

	Acceptance Rate (published in Cabell's)	Cabell's Difficulty of Acceptance Rating	Australian Business Deans (ABDC) Rating	Computer Science	Other	Points
Type I	0 - 20%	Rigorous (0-10%)	A* or A	ERA-A or CORE – A* or A		7
Type II	21 - 40%	Significantly Difficult (11-20%)	B or C	ERA-B, or CORE - B		5
Type III	41 - 60%	Difficult (>20%)	n/a	ERA-C or CORE C	Chapter in a refereed (peer or editorial review) scholarly book published by a recognized publisher; External Research Grants awarded through a competitively refereed process;	3
Type IV	> 60%	n/a	n/a	n/a	Publication in a refereed (peer or editorial review) trade journal	2
Type V	Not in Cabell's	Not in Cabell's	Not Listed in ABD		Other unlisted publication	0

Note: Faculty members seeking an exception to the quality standards described above may submit the work to be evaluated by the credentials committee. Faculty must include ample documentation including referee reports, scholarly reviewing procedures, acceptance rates, or other evidence to support their case. The credentials committee will produce a letter that documents evidence and supports the vote. Faculty seeking a higher quality ranking for grants must also produce evidence for referee process, level of competitiveness, and other documentation to evaluate the quality of the grant.

## Quantity

While teaching is the most important component of a faculty member's performance, conducting peer-reviewed research is essential to demonstrating that expertise. In any given five year period, faculty candidates for promotion and tenure are expected to produce at least three PRJs in

the five year review period, i.e., "3-in-5". Tenured faculty not seeking promotion must maintain a five-year portfolio of at least two PRJs plus a PIDE. Minimum quantities of scholarly works necessary for tenure and promotion are outlined in section 3.3.

Faculty may only count one PRJ or PIDE per review cycle. If a paper is reviewed once, accepted to a conference and published in proceedings, the faculty may either count the presentation (a PIDE) or the proceedings (a PIDE or PRJ), but not both. If the paper is reviewed once for the conference and a second time for the proceedings, it may be counted twice.

### **Continuity**

Continuity is a measure of how well a candidate's five-year scholarly portfolio is meeting expectations for quantity, quality, and impact. Continuity in performance is more meaningful than a short period of increased productivity. A faculty member's Annual Report is key to documenting continuity of research work.

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 publications. 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 publications. 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 that have led to working papers submitted to refereed journals for review. Involvement in such activities can provide evidence for an annual report that the faculty member meets expectations with respect to scholarly activity.

### **Impact**

The impact of the faculty member's five year portfolio of intellectual contributions is defined as the extent to which the faculty member's scholarly activities have "made a difference" to the university, academic field of expertise, students, or the business community. Examples of impact include, but are not limited to, the following: publications in leading peer-reviewed journals (i.e., those ranked in top 20 in published rankings from field experts on the quality of a journal, or journals with high visibility), citation counts, recognitions or awards from professional organizations, case studies leading to the adoption of new teaching/learning practices, media citations, requests from the practice community to speak about research, and invitations by governmental agencies to serve on policy making boards due to research expertise. At a minimum, the journal in which the article is published must be indexed by a bibliographic database.

### **Field Appropriateness/Relevance**

Items in the portfolio should match the faculty member's terminal degree, teaching responsibilities, and/or the mission of the college or university. The CBA values basic, applied and pedagogical research. A faculty member's portfolio can be made up of any of those types of work, but there must be at least one non-pedagogical work in the portfolio.

### **Authorship**

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 (i.e., first author or equivalent in terms of contribution). 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.

### 3.2.3.2 Expectations for Scholarly Work

Specific summative expectations of scholarly work for tenure and promotion are outlined in Section 3.3.3 and 3.3.5 respectively. Those expectations include specific numbers of articles, types of works, and quality expectations. Annual evaluations of scholarly activity are intended to be broader formative assessments.

Scholarly work is evaluated on an annual basis differently from teaching and service. All faculty members are expected to be effective teachers with good results every year. Likewise, all faculty are expected to have accomplishments in service every year. But research requires a longer timeframe to develop results. Most publications take well over a year to develop, write, submit, resubmit, and publish. Thus, assessment of a faculty member's performance in a single year is based on his/her efforts in that year to maintain their five year portfolio or, for new faculty, to develop their five year portfolio. It is the faculty member's responsibility to fully document in each annual report her/his efforts and results for the year.

Because faculty qualifications, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure decisions are based on the five year research portfolio, annual evaluations of all tenured and tenure track faculty focus on the faculty member's contribution to that research portfolio. For example, with respect to quantity, faculty candidates for promotion and tenure are expected to produce at least three PRJs in the five year review period, i.e., "3-in-5". Tenured faculty not seeking promotion must maintain a five year portfolio of at least two PRJs plus a PIDE, (see section 2.4.2).

The annual evaluation considers all six dimensions of scholarly activity. The overall rating for Scholarly Activity in a single year is the average of scores from the following table, except for faculty in years 1-3 of their appointment. Summative expectations for tenure and promotion are listed in section 3.3.

**Table 4**  
**Annual-Expectations for Scholarly Work**

	1 - Significantly Exceeds Expectations	2 - Exceeds Expectations	3 - Meets Expectations	4 - Performs Below Expectations	5 - Significantly Below Expectations
--	--	--------------------------	------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------------

Quality	At least 2 Type I publications in the 5yr portfolio, plus evidence of mostly Type I and/or Type II publications.	At least 2 Type I publications in the 5yr portfolio, plus evidence of some Type II or III publications.	At least one Type I in the 5yr portfolio, plus evidence of Type II and III publications.	No Type I in the 5yr portfolio, some evidence of Type II and III publications.	No Type I, II, or III in the 5yr portfolio.
Quantity	5 or more articles in 5 years.	4 articles in 5 years.	3 articles in 5 years.	1-2 articles in 5 years. Not meeting expectations for Scholarly Academic status	Zero articles in last five years
Continuity	Well established research pipeline consistently yielding an average of 2 or more research outputs (PRJs and/or others) each year.	Established research pipeline consistently yielding an average of 1-2 research outputs (PRJs and/or others) each year.	Research pipeline consistently yielding an average of 1 research output (PRJs and/or others) each year. On pace for “3 in 5”.	Minimally established research pipeline yielding an average of less than 1 research output (PRJs and Other) each year.	No evidence of research pipeline. Research activity not evident or not consistent in 5 years.
Impact	Recognized for significant impact on Academic discipline, university, students, or community.	Evidence of strong impact on Academic discipline, university, students, or community.	Evidence of moderate impact on Academic discipline, university, students, or community.	Evidence of little impact on Academic discipline, university, students, or community.	No evidence of impact on Academic discipline, university, students, or community.
Field Appropriateness / Relevance	Significant overlap with both CBA goals and Faculty member's teaching area.	Well aligned with both CBA goals and the faculty member's teaching area.	Somewhat aligned with teaching area or CBA mission.	Loosely aligned with teaching area or CBA mission.	Does not match teaching area or CBA mission.
Authorship	Significant leadership on multiple scholarly activities.	Leadership on at least 2 scholarly activities.	Leadership on at least 1 scholarly activity.	Evidence of contribution but not leadership on scholarly activities.	Evidence of minimal contribution to scholarly activities.

### 3.2.4 Committees and Other Professional Activities (Service)

While the Winthrop University Faculty Manual does not differentiate among types of service, service has three dimensions:

- university (including college and department)                      section 3.2.4.1
- discipline and professional activities, and                              section 3.2.4.2
- service to the community.    section 3.2.4.3

CBA faculty are expected to be active in university committees and other professional activities. The five year portfolio of faculty work related to service should contain some activities that make an impact on the university, academic field of expertise, the business community, or students. Impact is defined as the extent to which the faculty member’s work on committees and other professional activities have “made a difference” to the university, academic field of expertise, the business community, or students.

Although rare in occurrence, those university committees and other professional activities that require an inordinate amount of time due to the nature of the activity and leadership role assumed can be labeled as **Professional Stewardship**. Professional stewardship activities must be significant in nature, making a substantial impact on the university as a whole or a faculty member’s field of expertise (i.e., guiding national discourse or shaping regional leadership practices in the industry). Individual faculty members are responsible for documenting the related time commitments and impact on the university and/or field of expertise. Furthermore, professional stewardship activities must be approved by the Department Chair and Dean, prior to receiving the professional stewardship designation. The Department Chair and Dean must also give annual approval for those professional stewardship activities that last more than one year. In some cases, when a faculty member has obtained approval and can provide documentation of time commitment and impact on the university or field of expertise, professional stewardship can count for an output under scholarly activity.

### 3.2.4.1 University Service

University committees include activities conducted on behalf of the university. 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 of continuing education programs;
- application of faculty knowledge/expertise to support university initiatives;
- leadership roles in assessment initiatives;
- program coordination; and
- special administrative assignments.

**Table 5**  
**Performance Expectations for University and College Level Service Activities**

1 - Significantly Exceeds Expectations	2 - Exceeds Expectations	3 - Meets Expectations	4 - Below Expectations	5 - Significantly Below Expectations
Has demonstrated leadership and maturity by distinguishing himself/herself in multiple college and university service activities. Frequently serves in leadership positions at the college and university levels.	Has been actively engaged in college and university service functions. Often serves in <del>for</del> leadership positions, but mostly at the college level.	Has been actively engaged in College and university service, but rarely in a leadership position; takes university service functions seriously and makes positive contributions. Has assumed leadership positions at the department level.	Rarely takes part in college or university service. Never served in a leadership position.	Has shown an unwillingness to participate in college or university service functions.

### 3.2.4.2 Discipline Specific Activities

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 committees and other professional activities related to 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;
- facilitation of professional development programs or continuing education programs; and
- management of external grant programs.

**Table 6**  
**Performance Expectations for Discipline Specific Activities**

1 - Significantly Exceeds Expectations	2 - Exceeds Expectations	3 - Meets Expectations	4 - Below Expectations	5 - Significantly Below Expectations
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 committees and other professional activities with respect to leadership or time commitment has been of substantial benefit.	Has repeatedly committed time to discipline committees and other professional activities. This might include serving on an advisory board, holding office, or regularly reviewing 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 appropriate professional organizations,-and only occasionally attends professional meetings.	Does not maintain membership in professional organizations and does not get involved in any discipline committees, conferences, and other professional activities.

### 3.2.4.3 Community Service Activities

Service 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 committees and other professional activities. The scope of community committees and other professional activities 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.

Such committees and other professional activities 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.~~

Candidates are expected to document their community committees and other professional activities. 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.

**Table 7**  
**Performance Expectations for Community or Professional Service**

1- Significantly Exceeds Expectations	2 - Exceeds Expectations	3 - Meets Expectations	4 - Below Expectations	5 - Significantly Below Expectations
Has assumed leadership roles in at least one civic or community organization(s) and has volunteered significant amounts of time to community organizations.	Has either served in some leadership role in community organization(s) or consistently volunteered significant amounts of time or expertise to community organizations.	Has consistently volunteered his/her time or expertise to community organizations.	Has taken no leadership roles nor volunteered consistent time to community organizations.	Has not participated in civic or community organizations in any manner.
Has <del>found ways to</del> regularly involved students in community service.	Has often involved students in community service.	Has occasionally involved students in community service.	Has not involved students in community service.	Has not involved students in community service.

### 3.3 Application of the Review Criteria

#### 3.3.1 Annual Review

For the annual review, each faculty member is evaluated using the scales described in Section 3.2. For academic responsibility, teaching and service, these scales can be applied to the annual review with no additional explanations. For scholarly activity, it should be noted that Table 4 is designed to evaluate performance over multi-year review periods. In annual evaluations of research and service, consideration should be given to faculty rank.

### **3.3.2 Pre-Tenure Review**

As described in Section 3.1.2 "Pre-Tenure Review Process", the candidate will prepare a portfolio (see Section 1.2) of materials that documents his/her accomplishments and activities in each of the four areas described in Section 3.2. 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.

### **3.3.3 Tenure**

#### **3.3.3.1 Application of Academic Responsibility Criteria for Tenure**

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.

#### **3.3.3.2 Application of Student Intellectual Development Criteria for Tenure**

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 2.

#### **3.3.3.3 Application of Scholarly Activity Criteria for Tenure**

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 earns an overall rating of at least 3 on all Annual Evaluations during the probationary period in the area of Scholarly Activity. While Annual Evaluations of scholarly activity address all six dimensions described in section 3.2.3.1, there are additional minimum expectations for tenure in the areas of Quality, Quantity, and Relevance:

##### **Quality**

At least 15 quality points (see Table 3)

At least one Type I work

##### **Quantity**

At least three quality articles (Type I, II, or III)

Computer Science candidates must have at least one journal (PRJ, non-conference related) publication

##### **Continuity**



At least 5 total research outputs (PRJs and others)

Field Appropriateness / Relevance

At least one non-pedagogical work

### **3.3.3.4 Application of Committees and Other Professional Activities Criteria for Tenure**

Tenure is based upon sustained quality performance in committees and other professional activities 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 5. In addition, the candidate normally must have an appropriate record in either discipline committees and other professional activities or community service that will achieve a rating of at least 3 based on the scales in Table 6 or community committees and other professional activities that will achieve a rating of at least 3 based on the scale in either Table 6 or Table 7.

### **3.3.4 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.

### **3.3.5 Promotion**

See section 1.4 for the formal Definitions of Ranks of Assistant, Associate, and full Professor.

The cumulative record of the candidate under consideration for promotion is evaluated in the areas of academic responsibility, student intellectual development, scholarly activity, and committees and other professional activities. 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 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 committees and other professional activities candidates are expected to perform at a high level with respect to university service, but they have the option of choosing between discipline-specific activities and community service. Therefore, the criteria for promotion are to be applied with sufficient flexibility to recognize and capitalize upon the individual strengths of candidates.

#### **3.3.5.1 Application of Academic Responsibility Criteria for Promotion**

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 3 or better 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 scale in Table 1.

### **3.3.5.2 Application of Student Intellectual Development Criteria for Promotion**

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 2.

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 2 and demonstrated some of the characteristics of a rating of 2 will not be recommended for promotion to Professor.

### **3.3.5.3 Application of Scholarly Activity Criteria for Promotion**

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.

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 that yields ratings of at least 3 on all annual evaluations of Scholarly Activity during the review period. In addition to the dimensions of research evaluated annually, there are additional specific minimum expectations for promotion in the areas of Quality, Quantity, and Relevance:

#### Quality

At least one Type I work

At least 15 quality points (see Table 3)

#### Quantity

At least three quality articles (Type I, II, or III)

Computer Science candidates must have at least one journal

- (PRJ, non-conference related) publication
- Continuity
  - At least 5 total research outputs (PRJs and others)
- Field Appropriateness/Relevance
  - At least one non-pedagogical work

#### 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 ratings of at least 3 on all annual evaluations of Scholarly Activity during the review period. In addition to the dimensions of research evaluated annually, for promotion there are additional specific minimum expectations in the areas of Quality, Quantity, Relevance, and Non-quantitative Aspects:

##### Quantity

At least three quality articles (Type I, II, III) since the submission of the last promotion portfolio.

Computer Science candidates must have at least one journal (PRJ, non-conference related) publication

##### Quality

At least one Type I work

At least 15 quality points (see Table 3)

##### Continuity

At least 5 total research outputs (PRJs and others)

##### Field Appropriateness/Relevance

At least one non-pedagogical work

##### Non-Quantitative Aspects

Evidence of a significant leadership role in scholarly activity

### **3.3.5.4 Application of Committees and Other Professional Activities Criteria for Promotion**

The relative weight that is given to committees and other professional activities 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 committees and other professional activities 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 committees and other professional activities 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 service that will achieve a rating of at least 3 based on the scale in Table 5. In addition, the candidate must have an appropriate record in either discipline-specific activities or community service that will achieve a rating of at least 3 based on the scales in Tables 6 or 7, respectively.

Associate Professor to Professor:

Promotion to Professor is based upon sustained high quality committees and other professional activities 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 service that will achieve a rating of 2 or better based on the scales in Table 5. In addition, the candidate must normally have an appropriate record in either discipline-specific activities or community service that will achieve a rating of at least 3 based on the scales in Tables 6 and 7, respectively.

## **4. 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 three items, which can be found on the CBA Faculty Resources web page:

### **1. Peer Review Form for Personnel File**

This is a one page form, to be completed by the 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.

### **2. Peer Review Feedback Form**

This is a report prepared by the reviewer and discussed with the faculty member being reviewed. The material on the form will serve as the basis of feedback. This is the written feedback referred to in the system description. Although the written feedback will not be given to the chair, dean, or any other persons, the candidate may elect to include the feedback letter in the pre-tenure, tenure, or promotion portfolio.

### **3. Peer Review Data Collection Instrument**

This is a multi-page form to be used by the 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.

## **4.1 Peer Review of Non-Tenured Tenure-Track Faculty**

In addition to the annual evaluation process, all non-tenured tenure-track faculty members will be reviewed by a peer in the first and second 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.

In the first and second 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 committees and other professional activities, in addition to the annual evaluation by the department chair and dean.

#### **4.1.1 Process for Review**

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 in academic responsibility, student intellectual development, scholarly activity, and committees and other professional activities.
- 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.

## **4.2 Peer Review of Non-Tenure Track Faculty**

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 as well as reappointment reviews according to Section 5 below.

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.

### **4.3 Areas for Peer Review**

#### **Peer Review of Academic Responsibility**

Discussions of academic responsibility will 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 will 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 Committees and Other Professional Activities**

Discussions of committees and other professional activities 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 committees and other professional 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 committees and other professional activities, consideration should be given to university committees and other professional activities, discipline committees and other professional activities, and community committees and other professional activities.

### **5. Policy for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty**

All non-tenure-track appointments are for a specified term of service. The letter of appointment shall specify the length of the term of service. For a multi-year appointment, Department Chairs

will provide each non-tenure-track faculty member in the department a letter each year (using the annual review timeline) that provides an evaluation of the faculty member's accomplishments during the previous year. For a single year appointment, no annual review is required unless the contract has already been renewed. The letter should clearly and specifically address strengths and weaknesses in the performance of the faculty member as related to the particular roles and responsibilities of that faculty member.

For renewal of a multi-year appointment, the review process for each reappointment of non-tenure-track faculty must include formal review and written recommendations from the Department Chair, the CBA Personnel Committee, and the Dean. Non-tenure-track faculty are evaluated using the academic responsibility, student intellectual development, and committees and other professional activities (i.e., service) criteria described in Section 3. Scholarly activity is evaluated with respect to the expectations of scholarly contributions described in the letter of appointment. The assessment of the candidate's performance in any of these areas must address at least the following: (i) the faculty member's demonstrated professional competence; (ii) potential for future contribution to Winthrop University; and (iii) institutional needs and resources, (iv) maintenance of necessary credentials or qualifications to meet their academic or practitioner qualification.

The candidate is responsible for compiling the review materials (using the same timeline as that used for tenure-track candidates), including: Letter of Appointment, Vita, Performance Appraisals & Annual Reports, Student Evaluations, Peer Reviews (if available), and Candidate Material (i.e., the candidate provides documentation and evidence with respect to academic responsibility, student intellectual development (such as tests, exams, projects, and/or assignments), appropriate scholarly activity, and committees and other professional activities, such as documents/work produced by a committee). A separate folder will contain the Chair's recommendation, Personnel Committee recommendations, and Dean's statement. A favorable recommendation does not guarantee on-going employment beyond the non-tenure-track faculty member's negotiated contract term; however, reappointment of non-tenure-track faculty is contingent on a favorable reappointment review.

---

## **Policy for Adjunct Faculty**

---

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

### 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

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

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

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

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

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

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.

---

## **6. Consulting and Outside Employment**

---

Full time employees must submit appropriate university paperwork for any and all paid employment conducted during the term of their contract.

The Winthrop University policy regarding outside employment for faculty members is available on the Winthrop University Policy and Procedure Repository. Faculty should submit the appropriate request form.



## Appendix A

### CBA Checklist for Faculty Portfolio

for use in Pre-Tenure Reviews, Tenure Reviews, and Promotion Reviews

Items checked (√) will be provided by Dean's office.

- Cover sheet: date employed at Winthrop rank at original appointment date(s) promoted and years in each rank prior service credit granted at employment
- Table of contents
- Application letter by Candidate
- Vita
- Candidate material\*
- Performance Appraisals & Annual Reports
- Copy of the pre-tenure review letters (tenure portfolio only)
- Student Evaluations
- Statement of Scholarship & Support of Scholarships
- Separate folder for: (labeled Recommendations and Reports)
  - Chair's recommendation
  - Committee recommendations
  - Dean's statement

\*The candidate provides documentation and evidence with respect to academic responsibility, student intellectual development (e.g., peer-reviews, student samples, feedback, and other forms of documentation), scholarly activity (e.g., final copies of scholarly work, ~~rankings in Cabell's~~ quality documentation from the appropriate source, evidence of non-quantitative aspects), and committees and other service activities (projects, work samples, policies, or other ~~such as documents~~ work produced by a committee).