

Lundquist College of Business
Review, Promotion and Tenure Policy for Tenure Track Faculty
Final Dean's Level Draft

The Lundquist College of Business (LCB) review, promotion and tenure policies and procedures for tenure-track faculty (TTF) described in this document are presented in three sections. Section I presents the mission that forms the basis for the college's policies for promotion and tenure. Section II articulates the principles guiding the LCB's decisions regarding faculty promotion and tenure, and affirms the LCB's adherence to eligibility standards and review processes mandated by the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Section III describes LCB procedures for reviewing and evaluating the performance and accomplishments of tenure track faculty at different career stages.

This policy applies to all represented faculty and is intended to comply with all provisions of Article 20 of the CBA. In the event of any discrepancies or inconsistencies, the CBA language applies for represented faculty. This policy also applies to all unrepresented faculty, unless a university-wide policy exists that contradicts the terms of this policy.

I. Mission

The mission of the LCB, a professional school within the University of Oregon, is both academic and professional. The college offers degree programs at the undergraduate, masters, and doctoral levels. As an AACSB-accredited professional business school, the mission of the LCB includes advancing the frontiers of knowledge in business and business-related disciplines, assisting students to initiate and sustain productive careers in business, helping businesses make sound and principled decisions, and aiding business and society to interact constructively.

Recommendations for reappointment, promotion, and tenure by the college must be directed toward achieving the college's mission, consistent with the expectations and standards of performance identified in this policy.

The college expects high quality scholarship and teaching from all faculty members. All faculty members are also expected to provide service to the college, the university, the academic profession, and the community. Finally, the LCB expects constructive collegiality in pursuing the academic and professional goals of the college from all faculty, in accord with the university's mission as a public institution and our commitment to being an inclusive learning community.

This document addresses the general timetable, processes and standards of performance for evaluation and promotion, which are consistent with many other public research universities, particularly AAU institutions.

While this document describes processes and standards for evaluation and promotion, TTF are encouraged to communicate with their Department Heads regarding promotion and tenure decisions.

II. Principles and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure

A. Principles Guiding Promotion and Tenure Decisions:

Principle 1: The LCB uses quality and impact as indicators to evaluate scholarly contributions.

Faculty members' scholarship is evidenced in their contributions to a body of knowledge that advances understanding and application in their field of study. The quality of a faculty member's scholarship is determined using multiple indicators compiled in the faculty member's promotion and tenure file including the personal statement, publication record, external and internal reviewers' evaluations, grant-related work, teaching record, and other pertinent data. Quality indicators include the importance of the research questions being studied, peer evaluation of technical adequacy of research methodology, quality and ranking of publication outlets as determined by disciplinary standards, record in obtaining external and competitive peer-reviewed grants, and professional awards related to scholarly activity. Impact is defined as the spread and effect of the individual's research and scholarship. The evolution and significance of a faculty member's research agenda is evaluated in terms of its impact on other scholars, the professional community of practitioners, the policy environment, and the general public. Every candidate for promotion to either associate or full professor is expected to generate consistently high quality scholarly work that appears regularly in peer-reviewed publications.

Principle 2: The LCB criteria for promotion and/or tenure are inclusive to accommodate a wide range of scholarly approaches and research methods.

Different research questions require different disciplinary approaches and/or research methodologies. No one form of inquiry or research method should be presumed to have greater weight than another. Rather, all questions require rigorous and appropriate processes of inquiry. The promotion and/or tenure process does not pass judgment on one form of inquiry over another. Instead, the quality of the scholarship produced is judged based on the criteria established within that disciplinary tradition. Regardless of scholarly approach, the standards of independent peer review are used in the personnel review to gather evidence for the quality and impact of scholarly contributions. In their personal statements, candidates should provide sound rationales and contexts for their scholarly work including explanations of research methodologies selected, research themes and agendas, and choices of outlets of dissemination of scholarly work.

Principle 3: The LCB criteria for promotion and/or tenure represent a balance between being sufficiently explicit to allow a clear and common understanding of the performance standards, while not being so specific as to

prohibit reasonable and acceptable modifications or variations.

The normative expectation for faculty in tenure track positions is that they should publish regularly in refereed journals. Although the number of articles published in refereed journals is the traditional indicator of scholarly productivity, it is not the only measure. In judging the quality and impact of a faculty member's collective works, judgment criteria should allow reviewers to take into account and contextualize each faculty member's work in terms of research agenda, the nature of the discipline or field of study in which the research is being conducted, and the possibility that a variety of formats and forums may be appropriate for exposition of scholarly work.

Distinctions should be made regarding the difficulty, complexity, scale, and time required to conduct the research and prepare articles for publication as well as the faculty member's trajectory and development as a scholar. Some research programs lend themselves to reporting incrementally different findings from the same or similar studies, whereas others call for consideration of entirely new phenomena and/or methods for each study. The criteria for evaluating scholarly productivity go beyond mere quantity to include the consideration of rigor, quality, and impact.

Principle 4: The LCB acknowledges the importance of external funding in promotion and/or tenure decisions without creating an expectation that it is required.

External funding is not a requirement for promotion and/or tenure although external funding is valued in the Lundquist College of Business. Successfully securing external funding usually requires a rigorous external review process in which one competes with leading scholars in a field. Such competitions may require evidence of deep understanding of a field and the ability to make contributions to theory, methodology, or practice. Most grants are awarded after a peer review process and thus successful funding reflects recognition by peers of new or novel thinking, cutting-edge methods, or innovative approaches to complex problems. As such and in combination with other measures, external funding contributes positively to evidence in favor of promotion and/or tenure. Thus, external funding is valued as one indicator of scholarly productivity and success, but the ability to secure external funding should not be used as a substitute for more basic standards, such as quality and impact of the candidate's overall program of research and scholarship. It must also be acknowledged that external funding is differentially available to scholars depending on their interests and area of scholarly activity. Opportunities for external funding are rare in certain areas and more common in others. Thus, external funding, when it includes rigorous peer review, should be used as one indicator of scholarly activity but should not replace or supplant other indicators.

Principle 5: The LCB emphasizes the importance of effective teaching and advising in promotion and/or tenure decisions.

Faculty members in the LCB have a responsibility to be effective instructors. Candidates for promotion and tenure are therefore evaluated in terms of how their teaching assignments and course offerings contribute to the LCB's academic programs and concentrations. Other factors considered in evaluating a faculty member's instruction include the number of different courses taught, the size of courses (e.g., small seminars, large lecture classes), and the level of the courses (e.g., graduate, undergraduate). Candidates' teaching effectiveness is primarily evaluated in three ways: student feedback, peer evaluations, and a teaching portfolio.

Student evaluations, both quantitative and qualitative, can be a valuable tool for ascertaining students' judgments about the effectiveness of instruction and the quality of courses. However, the limitations of student feedback should be acknowledged. Student evaluations can reflect contextual factors outside the instructor's control. Therefore, when making interpretations of course evaluations, results should be compared to other relevant courses or groups that provide context for interpretation such as courses with the same class size, level (i.e., graduate vs. undergraduate) or class type (e.g., required versus elective, or small seminar versus large lecture class).

Student course evaluations are only one source of evidence of instructional effectiveness. Peer evaluations provide additional information on candidates' instructional accomplishments. Department Heads should arrange for periodic peer evaluation of assistant and associate professors' teaching. Faculty chosen to serve as peer evaluators should be familiar with the course content as well as methods of effective teaching. To ensure familiarity with course goals and content, a peer evaluator should review the course syllabus, course materials and assignments, and measures used to assess student progress prior to any observations. Following the observation, an evaluative report should be written to describe the results of the peer observation and evaluative review including such issues as instructional purpose, instructional strategies, effectiveness of presentations, quality of content delivered, completeness and currency of readings, texts, and course materials, quality of feedback provided to students, strategies for monitoring student learning and progress, student engagement, and content covered.

Teaching effectiveness can also be evaluated by examining a portfolio of teaching artifacts submitted as part of the candidate's tenure/promotion file. Portfolios often include course syllabi, assignments, tests or other assessments of students, the use of evidence-based or innovative instructional strategies, information on new course preparation and/or curriculum development, the use of technology to support teaching and learning, examples of student work or products, or other evidence of teaching practices and instructional effectiveness.

Principle 6: The LCB evaluates faculty by using evidence of the developmental progression of a faculty member's research and scholarship, teaching, and service.

Faculty development is considered to be a continuous process and therefore there is an expectation of a progression of research and scholarship, teaching, and service performance over time. Such maturation is observed in a diverse array of contexts and responsibilities. Differences are expected between the performances of junior faculty members in comparison with more senior faculty members.

The LCB expects faculty members to show a temporal progression in their scholarly accomplishments. As development progresses, greater impact is evidenced by publication in high quality journals with high impact ratings or journals that reach a broader audience of researchers, practitioners or policy makers. Progression in national stature should grow from national recognition at the assistant professor level, to an established national signature at the associate professor level, to established national scholarly leadership at the full professor level.

In teaching, faculty members' development can be observed in the increasing complexity of their syllabi and teaching goals (e.g., knowledge transfer, development of expertise, elimination of misconceptions). Faculty teaching should reflect a diversity of pedagogical strategies (e.g. didactic instruction, small group learning, web-based instructional materials). Faculty strategies for monitoring student learning should reflect the use of a number of different assessment and feedback approaches (e.g., individual projects, class presentations, tests and assessments, web-based instructional materials, peer critique). The use of these instructional and evaluative strategies should become more sophisticated and improve over time. Faculty members are expected to increase their graduate advising, mentoring, service on student degree committees, and chairing of dissertations over time as well.

A faculty member's leadership role in his/her department, college, university, and profession is expected to expand progressively over time. For example, assistant professors may serve initially on department/college committees and serve as ad hoc reviewers for journals; associate professors may serve on or chair a college/university committee, serve on journal editorial boards, and be elected to leadership roles in professional organizations; and full professors are expected to fulfill significant college, university and professional leadership roles (e.g., Department Head or Associate Dean, chair a significant college/university committee, serve as a journal editor, be elected to a major office in a national professional association).

B. Eligibility and Review for Promotion and/or Tenure:

Sections 12 through 20 of Article 20 of the CBA (2015-2018) describe in detail eligibility and review processes mandated by the CBA regarding tenure review and promotion. These policies are followed by LCB for all faculty, regardless of bargaining unit status, and will not be restated here.

C. Criteria for Awarding Promotion and Tenure

1. *Promotion to Associate Professor and Indefinite Tenure.* Indefinite tenure is normally granted coincident with a faculty member's promotion from the rank of assistant professor to associate professor. However, occasionally a faculty member is hired at the associate professor rank without tenure. Lundquist College standards for recommending tenure are the same for untenured associate professors being considered for tenure and for assistant professors being evaluated for promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure.

A favorable recommendation for the position of associate professor with tenure requires the candidate to have a significant record of high quality scholarly contributions to his or her field and of high quality, effective teaching. A significant record of high quality scholarship is interpreted to mean that the candidate's research is of a quality commensurate with work published in the top journals in the candidate's discipline, and of sufficient quantity such that both leading scholars in the candidate's field and departmental colleagues attest to the importance of the overall contribution of the candidate's research.

High quality, effective teaching is interpreted to mean that students and faculty peers evaluate favorably the candidate's teaching, organization and selection of course materials, and contribution to the teaching mission of the college across our programs.

Service contributions to the college, university, and profession are of lesser importance than scholarship and teaching to the recommendation for tenure, but constructively collegial contributions and professional behavior in support of the college's goals are expected of all faculty.

In evaluating candidates for promotion and tenure, performance in the areas of scholarly contributions, teaching, and service are weighted at 0.4, 0.4, and 0.2, respectively. Furthermore, there must be the expectation that the candidate will, within a reasonable period of time, meet the requirements for promotion to full professor.

A candidate who has been granted an extended probationary period by the Provost's office will be evaluated for promotion and tenure as if he or she had been in probationary status for the normal period of time, rather than the extended period of time.

2. *Promotion to Professor.* A favorable recommendation for promotion to professor with tenure requires a record of overall excellence that is expected to continue. Excellence in scholarship means the candidate will have achieved national recognition for the quality of her or his research by leading scholars in the candidate's field. As with requirements for associate professor with tenure, high quality effective teaching is expected. The ability to teach effectively across programs (undergraduate, masters, doctoral) and/or in a

variety of courses, at least within the faculty member's main field of training and expertise, is a prominent expectation of a candidate for professor. The candidate is also expected to provide effective leadership in the department, college, or university as well as meaningful service to the candidate's academic discipline and/or liaison with the business practitioner community in ways that contribute to the college's goals.

The LCB recognizes that excellence in *each* of the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service is a challenging standard of performance, and further, that tenured faculty are expected to assume greater institution-specific responsibilities than are faculty not yet granted tenure. The mix of research, teaching and service accomplishments demonstrating a record of overall excellence will vary somewhat across individuals. However, the standards of excellence in each area articulated in the paragraph above will apply in all but the most unusual circumstances. Exceptions are appropriate only when achievements in one area are truly extraordinary by national and international standards, reflecting sustained contributions over a long period. Moreover, contributions in each of the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service must be significant and meritorious.

Individuals applying for administrative positions, most often the Dean of the College, may have become less active in scholarship later in their careers as they have pursued an administrative career path and served in demanding administrative positions. In evaluating such candidates, a favorable recommendation for tenure will require that the individual at some point earlier in his or her career have achieved a record of scholarly contributions and accomplishment consistent with the college's current standards for tenure and rank.

III. Procedures for Reviewing and Evaluating Faculty Performance

A. Performance Reviews for Untenured TTF:

1. *Annual Reviews.* Each TTF member, including those holding the appointment of Acting Assistant Professor, who has not received tenure and is not in the process of being reviewed for tenure or for mid-term renewal will have an annual review conducted by his or her Department Head or designee. The goals of annual reviews are to evaluate performance, identify problems, and support faculty members in their progress toward positive outcomes of mid-term and tenure reviews.

Each TTF completes the LCB's Faculty Activity Report (FAR) in September of each year. The FAR compiles information provided by the TTF on research, teaching and service over the past 12 months. This information is supplemented with quantitative student course evaluations and signed student comments.

The Department Head or designee prepares a narrative report that describes and numerically rates performance in each of the three areas. To ensure consistency across all five LCB departments, the Dean or designee, and the Department Heads calibrate narratives and ratings. The report is shared with untenured faculty members during Fall term of that year. Untenured faculty members are invited to discuss their narrative report and ratings with their Department Heads and the Dean or designee. The narrative and/or ratings may be adjusted in light of these discussions, with Dean or designee determining the final narrative and ratings. The report is signed by the Dean and the untenured faculty member. The signed report is placed in the untenured faculty member's file and a copy is given to the faculty member.

2. *Mid-Term Reviews.* Mid-Term Reviews inform decisions about contract renewal. They occur approximately halfway between the initial tenure track appointment and eligibility for tenure. The timing of the Mid-Term Review is generally established at the time of the initial appointment. Depending on the number of years credit given for prior appointments, an untenured faculty member could receive his or her Mid-Term Review after one or two years' employment at LCB.

For a favorable reappointment recommendation, the college must reasonably expect that the candidate has the potential to achieve a favorable tenure decision in the future. This means either that:

- i) the candidate's record as of the Mid-Term Review, if sustained, would likely meet the standards for a favorable recommendation for tenure, or
- ii) the candidate's accomplishments as of the Mid-Term Review, while not sufficient if sustained at their current rate of achievement, show reasonable promise, based on demonstrated work in progress and/or a realistic set of goals and plan for achieving them, that the candidate will meet the standards for a favorable recommendation for tenure.

If the candidate's record does not meet either (i) or (ii) above, the college will usually recommend a terminal one-year appointment. In unusual circumstances, the college may recommend reappointment for a period shorter than a full renewal through the academic year of the tenure review (with an additional review, comparable to a Mid-Term Review, required in the last year of the renewal appointment).

Sections 7 through 11 of Article 20 of the CBA (2015-2018) provide details on the timetable and processes for conducting Mid-Term Reviews for untenured TTF. These sections are followed by LCB for all faculty, regardless of bargaining unit status, and will not be restated here.

B. Post-Tenure Performance Reviews for Tenured Faculty:

Faculty development is the primary purpose of post-tenure reviews. This is not a process to reevaluate tenure. Rather, it is designed to recognize accomplishments, identify shortfalls, and guide faculty along a path leading to positive outcomes for Associate Professors' seeking promotion to Full Professor, or in the case of Full Professors, to positive Sixth-Year Post-Tenure Reviews.

1. *Third-Year Reviews.* Third-Year Reviews will be conducted in the third year following promotion to Associate Professor and/or the award of tenure, and in the third year following a sixth-year post-tenure review. Primary responsibility for the third-year review lies with the Department Head, with oversight provided by the Dean or designee to ensure consistency across departments. The Department Head will notify eligible TTF members no later than winter term in the academic year the review is to be completed. The Department Head will request the following:

1. A comprehensive and current curriculum vitae.
2. A 3-6 page personal statement by the TTF member summarizing and evaluating professional activities over the period since his or her performance was last evaluated for promotion, tenure, or post-tenure purposes. The personal statement should explicitly address scholarship, teaching, and service accomplishments and contributions. The personal statement should also include discussion of any contributions to institutional equity, inclusion, or diversity.
3. A report of the accomplishments and benefits resulting from sabbatical, if applicable.

The Department Head will provide copies of the TTF member's student course evaluations for the period under review, including quantitative summary sheets and signed written evaluations, as well as at least one peer evaluation of teaching conducted during the period.

The Department Head will prepare a brief report summarizing and evaluating the faculty member's performance, and give copies to the Dean or designee and the faculty member. The faculty member may respond in writing within 10 days of receipt (an extension may be granted by mutual agreement between the faculty member and the Department Head). The Department Head may adjust the summary report in light of the faculty member's response. The Department Head will sign and date the final report, as will the Dean or designee, and the faculty member. The signed report, the faculty member's response, and all other review materials will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file. A copy will be given to the faculty member.

For Associate Professors, the Third-Year Review will present a candid appraisal of progress toward a positive evaluation for promotion to Full Professor. For Full Professors, the review will provide interim guidance

regarding accomplishments and concerns relating to the faculty member's upcoming comprehensive Sixth-Year Post-Tenure Review.

In cases where a prior Sixth-Year Post-Tenure Review has resulted in the creation of a development plan to mitigate unsatisfactory performance, the Third-Year Review will address the faculty member's success in addressing those concerns.

2. *Sixth-Year Post-Tenure Reviews.* Sixth-Year Post-Tenure Reviews will be conducted in the sixth year after a promotion or after a previous Sixth-Year Post-Tenure Review. In comparison to the Third-Year Review, the Sixth-Year Post-Tenure Review is a more extensive review and deeper analysis of the faculty member's scholarship, teaching and service. The Department Head, Unit Head or designee will notify the faculty member during the fall term of the year in which the review will take place and request the following:
 1. A comprehensive and current curriculum vitae.
 2. A 3-6 page personal statement by the TTF member summarizing and evaluating professional activities over the period since his or her performance was last evaluated for promotion, tenure, or post-tenure purposes. The personal statement should explicitly address scholarship, teaching, and service accomplishments and contributions. The personal statement should also include discussion of any contributions to institutional equity, inclusion, or diversity.
 3. A sabbatical portfolio, if applicable, that reports the accomplishments and benefits resulting from a sabbatical.

Once the Department Head has obtained all of the appropriate documents and information, he or she will establish a committee of tenured faculty members and provide the committee with access to the documents and information. The DH will then:

1. Obtain a report from the faculty committee including an assessment of the bargaining unit faculty member's performance;
2. Prepare his or her own evaluation of the bargaining unit faculty member's performance;
3. Provide both the faculty committee's report and the Department Head's report to the bargaining unit faculty member and allow him or her 10 days from the date of the receipt of the reports to provide responsive material or information, which shall be included in the evaluation file: and
4. Submit the evaluation file to the Dean.

The Dean or designee will review the file and may consult with appropriate persons and may obtain and document additional relevant information. Once the Dean deems the file complete, he or she will prepare a separate report and recommendation. The Dean will share this report and recommendation with the bargaining unit faculty member and allow 10 days from the date of receipt of the report to provide responsive material and information, which shall be included in the evaluation file. The Dean will then submit the complete evaluation file to the Provost or designee.

A full professor placed in the highest category of performance may be defined as “exceeding expectations.” The next highest category may be defined as “meeting expectations.” The third and final category may be defined as “failing to meet expectations.”

In the event that a Sixth-Year Post-Tenure Review leads to the determination that a faculty member’s performance “fails to meet expectations”, a development plan will be created through collaboration between the faculty member, the Department Head, and the Dean or designee. Ideally, there will be consensus regarding the development plan, but if consensus is not possible, a plan receiving the dean’s approval will be forwarded to the Provost or designee for review and approval. The development plan will be signed by all three parties, dated, and placed in the faculty member’s personnel file.