

STANDARDS/EXPECTATIONS

in the Promotion and Tenure process for the
Eller College of Management
Revised August 2005

College Standard – Associate Professor

A recommendation for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure requires that the candidate have developed a record of high quality scholarly contributions to his or her field and of high quality, effective teaching. High quality contribution is required in both scholarship and teaching: outstanding performance in one of these domains is expected. Moreover, there must be the promise that the candidate will within a reasonable period of time have accomplished the things that will justify promotion to full professor. This means national recognition for scholarship and published research, and continued development as a teacher and leader in his or her department.

College Standard – Professor

To be advanced to the rank of Professor in the Eller College of Management, it is expected that one will have achieved national recognition as a scholar by leading academic people in the field. One is expected to have developed an on-going research program directed to problems at the frontier of the field. The candidate is expected to be an effective teacher, and make contributions in the form of professional leadership to the department and the College, and service and/or liaison with the outside professional management community.

Expectations for Three Year Reviews

In the recruitment of a new assistant professor and at the three year review for reappointment, a major concern is the belief and the subsequent continued belief that the candidate has the potential to achieve eventually a positive outcome of a tenure review. When the accumulated evidence suggests that this belief is no longer valid, the decision is made not to reappoint.

At a three year review, a faculty member should have moved beyond the dissertation, having already established an independent research program. At this review, a faculty member must demonstrate, through a combination of scholarly publications and submitted papers, that the work being done will lead to national recognition in the field by the time of the mandatory six-year review. A faculty member must also be performing effectively as a teacher or should have demonstrated clear progress in moving toward teaching effectiveness

If in the review, the candidate has met the standards of the college, the recommendation should be for reappointment, or promotion and tenure, and the person should then be given every encouragement and support to continue his or her development. If, however, at review the candidate does not meet the college standard, then the recommendation should be for non-retention. To do otherwise might permit the exploitation of the individual for the short run gain of a department.

Economics Department

Promotion & Tenure Procedures

Promotion and tenure cases in the Economics Department are decided by a "committee of the whole." When the department considers a current faculty member for advancement to tenure, the committee consists of all tenured faculty members. When the department is considering a current faculty member for promotion to full professor, the committee consists of all full professors. This document describes the department's procedure in detail. *[This document deals only with internal cases.]*

Obtaining Evaluation Letters

For internal P&T cases the department aims to have letters from outside evaluators in hand by October 1. This requires that requests for evaluation letters be sent out before August 1. Letters are requested by the department chairman, who consults department faculty members in order to select the list of people who will be asked to write letters. The candidate is asked to submit names of potential evaluators as well, and typically one or two people from the candidate's list are asked to write. After the letters have been received, all faculty members who will vote on the case have access to the letters.

Reading Committee

The reading committee is the mechanism by which the department becomes well informed about the candidate's research. The reading committee is typically comprised of three department faculty members who are well qualified to read, evaluate, and report on the candidate's research. The committee is selected by the department chairman, in consultation with other department faculty members and with the candidate. While the norm is a three-person committee drawn from the department faculty, the committee may include more or fewer members, and may include one or more people from outside the department. The purpose of the committee is to provide the department's faculty with expert analysis of the candidate's research. Other members of the faculty often read one or more of the candidate's research papers as well. The reading committee produces a written analysis of the candidate's research, and also serves as a kind of consulting group to the faculty at the discussion stage.

Discussion

The faculty members who will vote all the case meet to discuss the case. The reading committee's report and the candidate's promotion dossier are circulated to the voting faculty members prior to the meeting, and the reading committee is available to provide further analysis during the discussion. Informal or "straw" votes may (or may not) be taken during the meeting.

Voting

The department's decision is reached by a vote which is taken at the meeting. The vote is anonymous, conducted via secret ballot.

Formal Report to the Dean

After the department's vote, the chairman writes a memo to the dean in which he summarizes the case and describes the department's decision. The chairman's memo is circulated to the voting faculty members before it is sent forward to the dean. This allows people to suggest changes before the memo is signed and forwarded, and it provides an opportunity for any committee member to add a memo dissenting from all or part of the summary. Any such memo(s) are forwarded, along with the chairman's memo, to the dean.

Note added on November 16, 2007:

This document was adopted by unanimous vote of department faculty members in November 2003. At present, however, we depart from the procedure described in the final paragraph above, because of objections raised every year by the College's Faculty Status committee to any participation by the department chairman in the faculty's decision.

Section 3

MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS

GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

The University policies and procedures governing Annual Performance Reviews, Promotion and Tenure are stated in the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel, chapter 3: "Personnel Policies and Procedures for Faculty". The MIS Department's policies and procedures are in accordance with those of the University. Where there is a disagreement between the University and an MIS guideline, University policy takes precedence.

Decisions regarding non-renewal, promotion and tenure of faculty members in MIS will involve the following levels of review (Handbook 3.3.02):

1. MIS Promotion and Tenure Committee
2. Department Head, MIS
3. College Standing Advisory Committee on Faculty Status
4. Dean of the Eller College of Management
5. University Standing Advisory Committee on Faculty Status
6. Provost

Decisions regarding promotion and tenure will be made at the intervals prescribed in chapter 3 of the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel. Assistant Professors will normally be reviewed before the ends of the third and sixth years. These reviews will be carried out separately from the Annual Performance Review by the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

The MIS Department's Promotion and Tenure Committee is a standing committee comprising three tenured faculty of the Department above the rank of the person being considered for promotion, but excluding the Department Head. The committee also includes one faculty member from inside the College, but outside the Department. This person is selected by the College Standing Advisory Committee on Faculty Status. The opinion of the Department's committee is communicated in a written report, which may include a minority report, to the MIS Department Head, who then transmits that report with his own recommendation to the College Standing Advisory Committee on Faculty Status. The following criteria for promotion are based on the guidelines set out in the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel.

Third Year Review Criteria

In the recruitment of a new assistant professor and at the three year review for reappointment, a major concern is the belief and the subsequent continued belief that the candidate has the potential to achieve a positive outcome of a tenure review. At a three year review, a faculty member should have demonstrated that they have moved beyond the dissertation, having already established an independent research program. At this review, a faculty member must demonstrate, through a combination of scholarly publications and submitted papers, that the work being done will lead to national recognition in the field by the time of the mandatory six-year review. A faculty member must also be performing effectively as a teacher or should have demonstrated clear progress in moving toward teaching effectiveness. Finally, in the three year review, a faculty member should demonstrate engagement with activities in the department and the larger field of MIS.

Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure requires a demonstration of excellence in research. In addition, the candidate must have developed a record of high quality effective teaching and be engaged in meaningful service activities.

Assessment of Research. Candidates must show evidence of productive and independent scholarly activity by developing a reputation for excellence among peers at this and other institutions. The primary evidence used to evaluate the quality of scholarly activity is a record of continual, sustained research that is demonstrated by high quality publications in top-tier peer-reviewed journals. Top-tier outlets are determined based on journal citation indexes, journal rankings, and peer evaluations. Both papers published and those accepted for publication¹ are included. Other elements of the evaluation can include any of the following:

1. Grants from agencies using a peer review process
2. Publications in conference proceedings
3. Presentations at national/international meetings and other universities
4. Chapters in research-oriented books
5. Honors or awards for research
6. Integrative and applied scholarship including translational research, commercialization activities, and/or patents.

The number of a candidate's publications is considered to be less important than their quality and importance in the field as judged by expert referees. Expert referees are invited to review and comment on the candidate's record. Expert referees are chosen based on their reputation in the larger field (and not necessarily the reputation of their current university). We recognize that a candidate's publication record may depend significantly on the kind of research she or he pursues; a rate of publication that is just adequate in one area may be exceptional in another. What is most important is that the candidate should have a clear record of sustained peer-reviewed publications from a focused, independent research program and exhibit promise of a sustained record of scholarly contributions. Over time, a candidate's record should demonstrate independence from his or her advisor and the ability to take the lead on research projects. Promise is demonstrated by papers that have been conditionally accepted, are currently under review, or are currently in progress. In addition, grant submissions demonstrate promise.

Assessment of Teaching. The candidate should have become an accomplished teacher as demonstrated by mastery of the fundamentals of the subject area(s) and ability to relate that knowledge to students. In addition to classroom teaching, other activities that contribute to the teaching evaluation can include:

1. Developing course materials
2. Developing a new course
3. Coordinating a course
4. Supervising independent study courses or student projects
5. Working with graduate and undergraduate students on research projects
6. Publishing pedagogical research
7. Chairing or serving on thesis and dissertation committees

Teaching should reflect a critical and selective balance of traditional and contemporary knowledge. Evidence of teaching quality is provided via student evaluations of teaching, peer review of classroom teaching and teaching materials, and special recognition of teaching excellence by the University or outside organization. We recognize that the nature of certain courses (e.g., required versus elective, majors versus non-majors, and small versus large sections) presents different expectations in terms of

¹Publication backlogs in the top-tier journals in MIS have, in recent history, been as long as two years. Candidates should not be disadvantaged due to journal backlogs.

evaluating quality. Just as in research, something that is just adequate for one course may be exceptional in another.

Assessment of service is based on the candidate's contributions within the University, to the scientific community at large, and to the community. Within the University, service comprises participation in extra-curricular activities, committee work, and other functions relating to the academic effectiveness of the MIS department and other components of the University.

Extramural service includes ad hoc reviewing of manuscripts and grant proposals, membership on journal editorial boards and grant-review panels, leadership roles in scientific societies, membership in conference and program committees, organization of national and international meetings and workshops, and other similar activities. In addition, service to the state and local community as it relates the mission of the department, college, and/or University can be a meaningful component of the candidate's service portfolio. The candidate is expected to perform a mix of service activities for the department, college, discipline, or community.

Promotion to Professor

Promotion to the rank of Professor depends upon continuation of high-quality research, as demonstrated by publications in excellent, peer-reviewed journals and could include successful competition for research grants as well as pursuit of integrative and applied scholarship including translational research, commercialization activities, and/or patents. In addition, the candidate should be able to lead research, guide students, and be known for his or her contributions to a particular area of inquiry. Impact is an important element of promotion and can be assessed using dimensions such as citation counts and H-index, in addition to the evaluations of external experts.

Service takes on increasing importance for promotion to Professor. Within the department, the candidate should mentor students and junior faculty and take on more leadership roles focused on advancing the department's, college's and university's goals. There is also an increased expectation of external service – external to the department, college, and University. The candidate should be an active participant on editorial boards, program committees, and other national and international committees. Candidates can also fulfill part of their service responsibilities through meaningful community service that reflects the mission of the department, college, and/or university.

Teaching should be of very high quality. While student evaluations are a part of this, it also includes developing new courses, advising students, mentoring doctoral students and junior faculty in their teaching, and teaching-oriented publications (research and/or texts).

The candidate should express a wider perspective and greater maturity of judgment than usual for junior faculty. Although difficult to characterize, these advance attributes reveal themselves in power of communication, ability to excel in teaching, strong leadership and innovation in research, cognizance of fields other than one's own and interdisciplinary interactions, and acceptance of responsibilities in the University, the extramural scientific arena, and the community.