

FACULTY ROLES AND REWARDS DOCUMENT

Evaluative Criteria, Procedures, and General Standards for Initial Appointment, Successive Appointments, Promotion, Tenure, and Annual Review of Faculty

Fogelman College of Business & Economics

Adopted: July 18, 2002

Revised: December 8, 2005

Revised: December 4, 2008

Revised: May 2, 2013

Revised: May 1, 2014

Revised: April 27, 2017

This document governs the Fogelman College of Business & Economics in the selection, retention, promotion, granting of tenure, and evaluation of faculty.

These College policies may be supplemented by policies of the Departments in the College and are required to be consistent with the policies of the University and the Tennessee Board of Regents. In case of conflict, the Board policy, the University policy, the College policy, and the Department policy will govern in that order.

Table of Contents

Contents	Page
I. Preamble	4
II. Roles and Responsibilities	4
A. Faculty Roles	4
1. Instructors/ Adjunct Faculty	5
2. Assistant Professors	5
3. Associate Professors	5
4. Professors	5
5. Distinguished Professors	5
6. Chairs of Excellence.	6
7. Department Chairs	6
B. Faculty Responsibilities	7
1. Teaching	7
2. Intellectual Contributions/Scholarship	8
3. Service	9
III. Annual Review and Planning	9
A. Purpose	9
1. Development	9
2. Evaluation	9
3. Due Process	10
B. Review Process	10
1. Faculty Planning	11
2. Dossier	11
<i>General</i>	11
<i>Teaching</i>	12
<i>Advising/Mentoring</i>	12
<i>Intellectual Contributions/Scholarship</i>	12
<i>Support</i>	12
<i>Outreach</i>	12
<i>Service</i>	12
3. Procedures	13
4. Overall Evaluation	14
<i>Exceptional Performance</i>	14
<i>Very Good Performance</i>	14
<i>Good Performance</i>	15
<i>Improvement Needed</i>	15
<i>Failure to meet Responsibilities</i>	15
<i>Intellectual Contribution/ Scholarships</i>	15
5. Faculty Development	16
6. Disclosure of Ratings to the Faculty	17
C. Administration of Merit Salary Increment Funds	17

D. Annual Renewal of Contracts of Tenure-track Faculty	17
E. Third-year Review	18
1. Purpose	18
2. Procedures	18
3. Review Criteria	18
4. Feedback	18
F. Decisions Concerning Graduate Faculty Status	19
1. Doctoral Faculty Status	19
2. Doctoral Mentors	19
3. Full Graduate Faculty Status	20
4. Associate Graduate Faculty Status	20
IV. Tenure and Promotion	20
A. Portfolios	21
B. External Peer Review	21
C. Application Process	22
1. Department Committee	22
2. Department Chair	23
3. College Committee	23
4. Dean	24
5. Provost	24
6. University Tenure and Promotions Appeals Committee	25
7. President	25
8. Regents	25
D. Criteria	26
1. Teaching	26
2. Intellectual Contributions/ Scholarships	26
<i>Assumptions</i>	27
<i>Journals</i>	27
<i>Books, Monographs, Research Grant Reports</i>	28
<i>Support</i>	29
<i>Information technology</i>	29
<i>Research in progress</i>	29
<i>Co-authorship</i>	29
3. Service	29
<i>Institutional Service</i>	29
<i>Professional Service</i>	29
<i>Outreach</i>	30
<i>External Funds</i>	30
4. Minimum Requirements	30
<i>Instructor</i>	30
<i>Assistant Professor</i>	30
<i>Associate Professor</i>	30
<i>Full Professor</i>	30
V. Appendix	32

I. PREAMBLE

The reputation of a College and its ability to attract excellent students and new faculty heavily depends on the reputation of its faculty as scholars and dedicated educators. The College has a responsibility for recruiting, developing, supporting, and retaining outstanding faculty. This document is intended to provide a framework to facilitate efforts to recruit, support, and nurture faculty as well as to recognize and reward contributions.

Several important principles guided the development of this document. First, any discussion of roles and rewards should recognize the diverse talents, skills, and interests of the faculty. Second, the faculty should feel confident that any review process is fair, consistently applied, in keeping with the mission of the College, and consistent with the role the faculty see for themselves in achieving that mission. Third, individuals closest to the activities of the faculty have the best information about the activities of the faculty and, under normal circumstances, also are best qualified to review performance in those activities. Fourth, participation in the review process is the right and expectation of faculty. And, finally, the process should ensure that all input and evaluative materials, regardless of source, be in writing to avoid input based on rumor or innuendo.

II. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

A. FACULTY ROLES

Each faculty member is expected to demonstrate a commitment to and competence in teaching, intellectual contributions/scholarship, and service activities. These roles can be broadened to include the related activities of advising/mentoring, support, and outreach. These activities are communal responsibilities; therefore, variation in emphasis is expected and encouraged among faculty. Accordingly, no single role description is appropriate for every faculty member. In fact, there probably are as many role definitions as there are faculty members in the College, each role reflecting the comparative advantages of the individual it represents.

Participation in College and University governance is an important part of the responsibility of a faculty member. Activities such as assisting in the recruiting of new faculty, participation in faculty meetings, responding to information requests on a timely basis, announcing and keeping office hours for students, and attending commencement exercises are part of the minimum expectations of all faculty members.

The academic activities also are interrelated, some activities spanning more than one category. For instance, journal editorship might be considered intellectual contributions/scholarship, service, or both. Dissertation supervision might be considered teaching, intellectual contributions/scholarship, or both. An increase in work effort in one category necessitates a decrease in effort in the remaining categories, allowing faculty to develop areas of comparative advantage which may vary over time, and which will be reflected in their annual allocation of

work effort. While specific roles are outlined below, it is important to recognize that each faculty member will provide unique contributions to the College mission and the roles described below should allow this flexibility.

All faculty are expected to adhere to the ethical standards set forth by their respective professional organizations.

1. Instructors/Adjunct Faculty

The major role of instructors and adjunct faculty is teaching. In addition, these individuals may be expected to provide limited advising and mentoring to students, assume a liaison role between the College and community, and participate in other department activities as requested. Instructors and part-time faculty are expected to possess appropriate academic or professional qualifications.

2. Assistant Professors

Assistant Professors are expected to devote their efforts primarily toward achieving the performance levels in teaching and intellectual contributions/scholarship that are required for promotion and tenure. Accordingly, the normal teaching load for Assistant Professors making satisfactory progress toward promotion and tenure (indicated by annual reviews of “good” or better) will be two courses per semester to provide time for intellectual contributions/scholarship activities. Exceptions may be necessary in specific situations when intellectual contributions/scholarship expectations are lower. Contributions in other areas will be minimized and commensurate with these expectations as reflected in the annual plan of activity agreed upon by the faculty member and Department Chair.

3. Associate Professors

Individuals holding the ranks of Associate Professor are expected to continue the levels of intellectual contributions/scholarship and teaching appropriate for this rank. The distribution of work efforts and contributions to specific activities should be clearly reflected in the annual plan and review.

4. Professors

Individuals who have achieved the rank of Professor have done so on the basis of distinction in teaching and intellectual contributions/scholarship. Professors are expected to continue the levels of activity appropriate for this rank. The distribution of work efforts and contributions to specific activities should be clearly reflected in the annual plan and review.

5. Distinguished Professors

A distinguished professorship is an honor bestowed upon professors who are widely recognized for their sustained excellence in teaching and intellectual contributions/scholarship and who have provided exemplary service to the University or to their profession or to the public through professional activity. They are expected to continue to contribute at the same level of excellence in specific areas in accordance with the individual’s contractual agreement or letter of appointment and as reflected in the annual plan and review.

6. Chairs of Excellence

Individuals appointed to Chairs of Excellence have achieved national and/or international prominence in teaching and intellectual contributions/scholarship. It is expected that this level of activity be maintained in accordance with the individual's contractual agreement or letter of appointment. Due to the particularistic nature of these agreements, Chairs and Distinguished Professors may demonstrate a great degree of variability in their specific activities. The distribution of work efforts and contributions to specific activities should be clearly reflected in the annual plan and review.

7. Department Chairs

The Department Chair/Director is responsible for the management of the faculty and resources of the Department in order to help achieve the stated objectives of the Department, College, and University. Department Chairs/Directors are elected by the Department faculty and approved by the Dean. The appointment is for four years with renewable terms upon reelection by the Department faculty.

Specific responsibilities of the Department Chair include, but are not limited to:

1. Ensuring that all Department activities meet or exceed the standards required by AACSB.
2. Managing the Department's academic programs within the general framework established by the College and the University. These activities include:
 - a. Scheduling courses
 - b. Managing courses (content organization for core classes, offering/canceling classes, capping enrollments)
 - c. Balancing programmatic needs with student credit hour production
3. Managing the Department's faculty resources within the guidelines of the University, College, and Department. These activities include:
 - a. Conducting annual evaluations of Department faculty
 - b. Allocating merit/equity pay raises
 - c. Facilitating management of salary negotiations for new and existing faculty and staff
 - d. Determining faculty teaching loads in accordance with section III.B. of the R&R document
 - e. Developing annual contract renewal recommendations for tenure-track faculty and one-year appointment instructors
 - f. Evaluating faculty as part of the tenure/promotion process
 - g. Evaluating faculty as part of the third-year review process
 - h. Evaluating professional development leave requests
4. Contributing to the overall mission and objectives of the College by
 - a. Conducting strategic planning activities at the Department level
 - b. Developing an annual report of Department activities to assess the achievement of Department objectives
 - c. Participating in the development of the College's strategic plans, budget requests, and justification for faculty positions
5. Managing student issues, such as
 - a. Grade appeals

- b. Advising and career counseling activities
 - c. Complaints
 - d. Requests for transfer credit or credit-by-examination or course validation
 - e. Late drops and adds
6. Coordinating activities between the Department and business community, including
- a. Developing and maintaining a Department advisory Board
 - b. Participating in outreach activities to generate external funding
 - c. Maintaining relevant databases for outreach activities

The performance of Department chairs is evaluated by the Dean. The Dean solicits feedback from College faculty and other College administrators as needed to complete the review. The faculty aspect of their annual review and evaluations are conducted by the Dean employing the same criteria as used for the faculty.

B. FACULTY RESPONSIBILITIES

1. Teaching

Effective teaching is an essential component of the mission of the Fogelman College of Business & Economics. All faculty members are expected to do their best to provide students with a stimulating learning experience. The technical competence dimension of teaching effectiveness includes a faculty member's knowledge of the content area and ability to understand major issues in the area. Technical competence requires awareness of new developments in one's field, familiarity with mainstream research, and an awareness of current practical problems that is necessary to blend theory and application in meaningful ways. Pedagogical expertise is another essential dimension of teaching effectiveness. Effective teachers on this dimension use an appropriate combination of communication skills, media, and learning tools to effectively convey concepts and motivate students to learn.

Teaching encompasses classroom instruction, course development, dissertation supervision, testing, grading, and the professional development of the faculty member as a teacher. Teaching should be evaluated, rewarded, and encouraged in ways parallel to those of intellectual contributions/scholarship. Advising and mentoring students may be a significant aspect of the teaching role for some faculty.

In addition, evaluation of the College's instructional program includes assessment of student learning in multiple ways to support program improvement and to address accreditation requirements. Faculty members have the responsibility to support and participate in College activities related to the assessment and assurance of learning that measure how well degree programs meet specified objectives for student acquisition and development of knowledge, skills, and abilities. Following assessment of program effectiveness, the faculty should use these data to guide decisions and actions that improve the curriculum to better meet instructional goals.

Teaching responsibilities of faculty are related to the faculty member's preferences, demonstrated performance in intellectual contributions/scholarship and other contributions. Every other year, as part of the annual faculty evaluation process, determination will be made by the Department Chairs as to faculty teaching loads for the following two calendar years. For a

full-time faculty member engaged primarily in classroom teaching, the normal maximum teaching load is 12 credit hours each semester. For others, the assignment of teaching loads will be based primarily on the annual intellectual contributions/scholarship performance review (which includes the previous three years of intellectual contributions/scholarship including research in progress). Additionally, the Department Chairs should consider the previous three years of efforts and future efforts when planned activities include service, outreach activities, teaching innovations, unusual teaching responsibilities, international initiatives, technology initiatives, or other activities that support the overall mission of the Fogelman College of Business & Economics. Teaching load decisions are subject to the ability of the College/Dean and Departments to maintain AACSB standards. The number of different courses taught and other appropriate considerations will be used to determine teaching load. Regardless of overall teaching load, every effort should be made to keep the number of preparations to two or fewer per semester. Those faculty members involved in grant research and contracts may use project budgets to “buy out” portions of their teaching loads.

The teaching of noncredit courses or workshops and participation in externally funded University projects may be substituted by the College for an equivalent number of credit courses with the concurrence of the faculty member.

Summer school teaching priority will be based on performance. When budget considerations do not permit accommodating every faculty member desiring two course assignments in a summer term, the allocation of a second course will be based on a three-year average of overall ratings from annual reviews. Following the hiring of a new faculty member, course allocations will be based on the previous year’s ratings the first year and a two-year average the second year. Exceptions may be made by the Dean’s office in consultation with Program Directors and Department Chairs to accommodate specific courses that must be taught by specific professors. The same process will apply for first course priority in years when budget considerations do not permit every faculty member desiring one course assignment in a summer term.

2. Intellectual Contributions/Scholarship

Intellectual contributions/scholarship advance knowledge and learning by producing new ideas and understanding. It is a fundamental responsibility of faculty and constitutes the foundation upon which all other activities are built. Faculty members demonstrate their scholarly contributions through products such as books, articles, chapters, and other output evaluated by peers (including the nonacademic professional community where appropriate). Intellectual contributions/scholarship includes the following four subcategories (in alphabetical order):

Application: The intellectual contributions/scholarship of application adds to existing knowledge in the process of applying intellectual expertise to the solution of practical problems, and it results in a written product that is shared with others. The intellectual contributions/scholarship of application may include activities of the following kind, when such activities result in written products open to peer review: technology initiatives; the development of content-based seminars and workshops; the provision of technical assistance; and contract research undertaken through the University.

Inquiry: The intellectual contributions/scholarship of inquiry involves rigorous investigation aimed at the discovery of new knowledge. In many ways, inquiry serves as the basis for other forms of intellectual contributions/scholarship. Evidence of activity in this area includes scholarly publications, funded research, and presentations at professional meetings.

Integration: The intellectual contributions/scholarship of integration makes meaningful connections between previously unrelated topics, facts, or observations. Examples are cross-disciplinary synthesis and the conceptualization of an integrative framework. Evidence of activity in this area includes publications and presentations at a suitable forum.

Teaching: The intellectual contributions/scholarship of teaching focuses on transforming and extending pedagogical knowledge. Examples include textbooks, software, and educational articles. Innovative contributions to teaching, insofar as they are published or presented in a peer-reviewed forum, also constitute intellectual contributions/scholarship of teaching.

The preceding definitions of intellectual contributions/scholarship are provided in the Faculty Handbook of the University of Memphis. They are generally consistent with the definitions provided by the AACSB standards as “intellectual contributions/scholarship.” The combined intellectual contributions/scholarship categories of “inquiry” and “integration” in this document correspond to the “basic intellectual contributions/scholarship” category of intellectual contributions/scholarship in AACSB guidelines (see Section III. 4).

Finally, seeking research grants is encouraged. Success in this endeavor – particularly when the grants are competitive and peer-reviewed – is a valued component of intellectual contribution and scholarship.

3. Service

Service includes University service, service to the profession, service to faculty and students, outreach, and fund-raising activities. These functions may overlap in some instances. Examples of University service include participation on committees and task forces, faculty mentoring, program assessment, advising student organizations, and serving on the Faculty Senate. Service to the profession includes association leadership, journal editorships, article reviewing and grant proposal review, and guest lecturing. Service to faculty includes technology diffusion, and service to students includes online and offline advising. Outreach refers primarily to sharing professional expertise with parties outside the University but, under some circumstances, may include nonprofessionally related activities outside the University (for instance, chairing the United Way campaign). Executive education and training through the University are encouraged and recognized as important outreach activities. Private consulting and training activities are encouraged but not rewarded in the review process.

III. ANNUAL REVIEW AND PLANNING

A. PURPOSE

All faculty members are reviewed annually. These performance reviews are the basis for recommendations for reappointments, annual merit pay increases and market equity adjustments, promotion and tenure, summer teaching, and teaching load assignments. The faculty review system in the Fogelman College is designed to serve the following purposes:

1. Development:

- To provide a means of recognizing, rewarding, and reinforcing meritorious performance.
- To provide information that can be used by the faculty member for self-improvement.

2. Evaluation:

- To serve as the basis for decisions about salary merit increases, teaching loads, contract renewal, promotion, summer teaching, and tenure.
- To serve as a means for assessing faculty contributions.
- To provide a means whereby differences in faculty responsibilities can be managed fairly.

3. Due Process:

- To provide a means for protecting faculty from arbitrary actions, favoritism, and discrimination.

B. REVIEW PROCESS

The procedures described in this document are intended to be consistent with, but do not substitute for, any TBR or University guidelines. They also apply to all faculty members, regardless of rank.

The annual review process is conducted during the spring semester. This review has two parts. One is a review of the faculty member's accomplishments during the preceding year (with a three-year window for intellectual contributions/scholarship), using the previously agreed-upon plan of activities as the basis. The other is establishing a plan of activities for the next year, including percentage distribution of efforts in each category of activities.

The review will consider the faculty member's performance in all areas that further the mission of the University and College:

- Teaching
- Advising/Mentoring
- Intellectual Contributions/Scholarship (of Application, of Inquiry, of Integration, of Teaching)
- Support (activities generating external resources and internal grants)
- Outreach
- Service

The primary role of a faculty member is education. Therefore, individual faculty should contribute primarily in teaching and intellectual contributions/scholarship, but contributions in some other area are expected. It also is understood that relative contributions will vary among faculty, and these variations will be evident from the individual faculty member's plans of activity, reflecting her/his talents and interests and the needs of the College. Significant investment of quality time and effort is required to excel in any endeavor. Faculty members are encouraged to excel in their areas of strength. Collective contributions will ensure the College as a whole will excel. An individual faculty member will specialize according to his/her comparative advantage.

Faculty holding an administrative appointment will have less teaching and intellectual contributions/scholarship expectations, but for purposes of promotion and tenure, administrative responsibilities will carry no weight. The administrative performance of all faculty holding administrative positions will be reviewed on an annual basis. The Dean will review the performance of faculty in administrative appointments using an appropriate review procedure

and evaluation instrument. Any process used by the Dean must include the opportunity for anonymous input from all faculties.

Any and all reviews of a faculty member’s professional performance will be conducted with the full knowledge of the faculty member, will allow the faculty member to be informed of the findings prior to the transmittal of the conclusions of the review to the Dean’s office, and will allow the faculty member to verify that the review has been based on full and complete information.

1. Faculty Planning

Each faculty member and the Department Chair will agree during a planning process in the spring about how time should be allocated during the following academic year. The needs of the faculty member, as well as the needs of the Department, should be considered in this process. The time allocation is subject to approval by the Department Chair and Dean. Teaching loads are assigned by the Department Chairs and determined by a number of factors including faculty research efforts, departmental needs, grants, assigned duties, contracts, and agreements.

Some examples of time allocations are illustrated below. These apply only to tenured/tenure-track faculty. Contractual agreements may cause minor variations in these percentages. Tenure-track (i.e., untenured) faculty are strongly encouraged to devote approximately 50% of their time allocation to intellectual contributions/scholarship activities which lead to high-quality, peer-reviewed publications.

Examples of Annual % of Time Allocation

Category (Per Semester)	Teaching (%)	*Intellectual Contributions/ Scholarship (%)	Service (%)	Total (%)
12 Hours Teaching	80	5-15	5-15	100
9 Hours Teaching	60	20-30	10-20	100
6 Hours Teaching	40	40-50	10-20	100
Department Chairs/ Directors	20	5-15	65-75	100
Distinguished Professors	20-40	50-60	10-20	100
Chairs of Excellence	20-30	50-60	10-20	100

** Non-tenure-track faculty may elect to have 0% in intellectual contributions/scholarship.*

Each class will be counted as 10% teaching effort on the planned time summary in accordance with University policy (e.g., someone teaching 2 classes per semester would have 40% allocated to teaching).

[NOTE: For a determination of a faculty member’s teaching load, see the teaching load section.]

2. Dossier

Each faculty member prepares a dossier summarizing his/her activities since the previous review (and for the two prior years for intellectual contributions/scholarship), as well as his/her plans for the following year. The dossier should include the following:

General:

- An updated curriculum vita (using the required University format)
- A narrative summary of activities consistent with the categories identified in the Evaluation and Planning Report (teaching, advising/mentoring, intellectual contributions/scholarship, support, outreach, and service).
- A completed Planning Summary, including percentages of time required by the TBR.
- Any supporting material useful for reviewing activities specified in the plan of activity for the year under review. In the dossier, faculty may highlight activities that contribute to the University and College missions.

Teaching:

Because the review of teaching is primarily a qualitative process, multiple sources of evidence are encouraged. Creative and effective use of innovative teaching methods and curricular innovations are encouraged.

- Summary pages (and other portions deemed pertinent by the faculty member) of the SIRS evaluations for each section of each course taught during the spring, summer, and fall semesters of the preceding calendar year.
- Description of innovative teaching methods and curricular innovations. (It should be emphasized that these activities are encouraged. Identifying them here will help ensure that appropriate risk-taking is not penalized in the review process.)
- Supervision of independent studies and dissertations.
- Any additional information the faculty member feels is indicative of teaching accomplishments.

Advising/Mentoring:

- Description of advising or mentoring activities.
- Any additional information the faculty member feels is indicative of accomplishment in advising/mentoring activities.

Intellectual Contributions/Scholarship (of Application, of Inquiry, of Integration, of Teaching):

- List of published papers, books, monographs since the review date of the previous year and separately for the previous two review periods.
- Letters of acceptance for papers accepted but not yet published.
- Any additional information the faculty member feels is indicative of intellectual contributions/scholarship accomplishments. (This should include information pertaining to innovative intellectual contributions/scholarship activities. Identifying them here will help ensure that appropriate risk-taking is not penalized in the review process.)

Support:

- List of proposals accepted or under review by funding sources external to the College.
- Any additional information the faculty member feels is indicative of accomplishments in support activities.

Outreach:

- Summary of outreach activities.
- Any additional information the faculty member feels is indicative of accomplishments in outreach activities.

Service:

- Summary of College, University, and public service activities.
- Any additional information the faculty member feels is indicative of accomplishments in service activities.

The dossier will be returned to the faculty in a timely manner following the completion of the review process.

3. Procedures

Listed below are specific dossier procedures that must be observed for the preparation of the review process.

- Faculty submits the complete dossier to the Department Chair on or before March 15.
- In an effort to capture the full scope of contributions made by each faculty member, the Department Chair may solicit input from other College faculty and administrators as appropriate for each faculty member on the quality of his/her teaching, outreach, service, and advising/mentoring activities. (For instance, the Directors of the EMBA and IMBA programs and the Chairs of various University and College committees may be asked to provide written input as appropriate to their programs and/or activities regarding the faculty member's performance.
- All solicited input is in the form of a memorandum written to the faculty member and copied to the Department Chair, pertains only to activities under the writer's direction, and is an independent part of the dossier. At any point during the process, the faculty member can review it for completeness; and any contributor to the dossier can review his or her contribution for completeness.
- All Department Chairs will meet as a group to review and coordinate review criteria and parameters. The objective of this meeting is to facilitate consistency across Departments in the assignment of performance categories to individual faculty. The review that follows is a two-step process, first at the Department level and then at the College level.
- In the first step, the Department Chair provides a preliminary narrative review for each faculty member in his/her Department about accomplishments in each of the three activities: Teaching/Advising/Mentoring, Intellectual Contributions/Scholarship (of Application, of Inquiry, of Integration, of Teaching, Support (grants)), and Service/Outreach. Performance ratings of the three activities will be weighted by planned distribution of efforts to arrive at an overall performance rating.

- The Department Chair meets individually with each faculty member, shares the preliminary review, and invites response. After the meetings with each faculty member, the Department Chair provides both the final, signed Department reviews and faculty dossiers to the Dean's office.
- Any additional comments by the Department Chair group or the Dean are added to the dossier and are provided to the candidate and the Department Chair along with written explanations.
- Dossiers are forwarded to the Provost by April 30. If a faculty member disagrees with the Department Chair's review or the Dean's review, he/she may submit a written response (2-page maximum), detailing the reasons for the disagreement and providing supporting material if appropriate. This response becomes part of the materials forwarded to the Provost. [The faculty member also can avail himself or herself of any remedies offered by the University Grievance Process and Conflict Resolution policy.]

4. Overall Evaluation

The overall evaluation is derived from separate evaluations in the three areas of teaching, intellectual contributions/scholarship, and service. The goal is to provide a comprehensive, simple, flexible, and fair faculty performance mechanism which (1) promotes faculty participation; (2) increases faculty performance, morale, motivations, and collegiality; (3) is verifiable; and (4) contributes to the achievement of the mission of the Department, College, and University.

Department Chairs will provide written evaluations for each of the three categories of teaching, intellectual contributions/scholarship, and service. These evaluations will be combined to determine the overall evaluation, taking into account the amount of time and contributions allocated to each category. Each faculty member is responsible for planning, and substantiating performance measures by providing the Department Chair with evidence related to teaching, intellectual contributions/scholarship, and service. Where warranted and appropriate, Department Chairs should give due consideration during the evaluation process to the unusual nature of a particular discipline within the Department. The following guidelines are intended to provide a basis for the overall evaluation.

Exceptional Performance

To be eligible to receive an overall *exceptional* rating, the individual must be rated *exceptional* in at least 60 percent of the evaluation components and must be rated as *exceptional* in at least two of the three general areas of teaching, intellectual contributions/scholarship, or service. No person will receive the *exceptional* overall rating if he/she receives *improvement needed* or *failure to meet responsibilities* in any category. Having met the minimum requirement does not provide assurance of an overall *exceptional* rating.

Very Good Performance

To be eligible to receive an overall *very good* rating, the individual must be rated *very good* in at least 60 percent of the evaluation components and must be rated as *very good* in at least two of the three general areas of teaching, intellectual contributions/scholarship, or service. No person will receive the *very good* overall rating if he/she receives *improvement needed* or *failure to meet*

responsibilities in any category. Having met the minimum requirement does not provide assurance of an overall *very good* rating.

Good Performance

To be eligible to receive an overall *good* rating, the individual must be rated *good* in at least 60 percent of the evaluation components and must be rated as *good* in at least two of the three general areas of teaching, intellectual contributions/scholarship, or service. No person will receive the *good* rating if he/she receives *failure to meet responsibilities* in any category. Having met the minimum requirement does not provide assurance of an overall *good* rating.

Improvement Needed

An individual will receive an overall *improvement needed* rating if the individual is rated *improvement needed* in at least 50 percent of the evaluation components.

Failure to Meet Responsibilities

An individual will receive an overall *failure to meet responsibilities* rating if the individual is rated *failure to meet responsibilities* in at least 50 percent of the evaluation components.

Department Chairs/directors are responsible for effectively communicating the Department's established evaluation policies and procedures regarding teaching, intellectual contributions / scholarship and service to individual faculty.

Intellectual Contributions/Scholarship

Department Chairs will be required to provide an annual evaluation of intellectual contributions/scholarship. This evaluation should be based on the faculty member's intellectual contributions/scholarship activities over the last three years or length of employment if less than three years. Current year publications will receive full credit, with weightings for previous years' contributions determined by individual Departments. Each faculty member will be rated as *exceptional*, *very good*, *good*, *improvement needed*, or *failure to meet responsibilities*.

The components of intellectual contributions/scholarship are:

- **Instructional Development:** The enhancement of the educational value of instructional efforts of the institution, Department, or discipline. This enhancement must take the form of regional and/or national peer-reviewed recognition of pedagogical innovations.
- **Applied Intellectual Contributions/Scholarship:** The application, transfer, and interpretation of knowledge to improve management practice and teaching.
- **Basic Intellectual Contributions/Scholarship:** The creation of new knowledge and/or the enhancement of the existing knowledge.

The tenured and tenure-track faculty of each Department will establish a list (approved by a simple majority of tenured and tenure-track faculty in the Department) of A, B, and C level journals. Other examples of intellectual contributions/scholarship consist of various forms of intellectual contributions/scholarship including publication in refereed journals, research monograph publications, textbooks, chapters in textbooks, scholarly books, chapters in scholarly books, proceedings from scholarly meetings, research grants, papers presented at faculty research seminars, case development, electronic software development, electronic publications, and in-house publications. Intellectual contributions/scholarship other than journal articles will be

evaluated by the Department. Each Department will establish a periodic review and revision process supported by published external validation and reviewed no less than every three years to accommodate new journals or changes in the ranking of existing journals.

Faculty who publish in journals that are not on the list should provide external evidence acceptable to the Department to support the quality of the publication. If a faculty member publishes in a journal not on his or her Department's list but on the list of another Department, the faculty member will receive credit equivalent to that of the other Department's rating.

Teaching

Department Chairs are required to provide an annual evaluation for the teaching area. For unusual or exceptional teaching, the Department Chair may exercise discretion to give credit in the current year for prior year's efforts. Each faculty member will be rated *exceptional, very good, good, improvement needed, or failure to meet responsibilities*.

Factors that should be included in the process of evaluating teaching performance for a faculty member include the following considerations: (1) SIRS scores; (2) level of the course (lower division, upper division, or graduate); (3) class enrollment size; (4) observations of teaching by the Department Chair and or peers; and (5) other considerations that the faculty member and the Chair agree during the activity planning discussion for the coming year should contribute to teaching performance.

Service

Department Chairs will provide an annual evaluation of service. Service includes the following categories: (1) University committees; (2) College responsibilities assigned by the Dean; (3) Department responsibilities (committees, student advising, etc.) assigned by the Department Chair; (4) contract research grants; and (5) service to professional, business, and civic organizations. For unusual or exceptional service, the Department Chair may exercise discretion to give credit in the current year for the prior year's service. Each faculty member will be rated *exceptional, very good, good, improvement needed, or failure to meet responsibilities*. Each Department will maintain a document that defines performance expectations for faculty service contributions.

Department Chairs should consider the quality of service being provided as well as the time commitment required to perform the service activity. Peer evaluation of faculty serving on committees provides an example of a way that Department Chairs may receive feedback about quality.

5. Faculty Development

If it is determined through the annual review process that individuals should participate in faculty development activities, opportunities to address the identified need for specific areas of improvement will be provided. Failure either to participate in a recommended program or to otherwise attain a required level of performance or credential may justify appropriate administrative action. (TBR memorandum, January 8, 1992).

After the Department Chair has recorded his or her opinion, he or she should confer with the faculty member who may then comment on any aspect of the review and attach any written comments he or she wishes to make. Full notice of the correction of any weakness revealed by a

review will be included in the faculty member's personnel file. The forms are forwarded through the Dean and the Provost. The Dean and the Provost are expected to ensure that the Department Chair evaluates faculty members properly according to the forms adopted by the Departments and approved by the Dean and Provost. They are also responsible for ensuring that the Department Chair uses the review results appropriately in subsequent personnel actions (e.g., promotions, salary adjustments, work assignments, etc.). While years of service and faculty rank are important factors, the annual reviews of the faculty member's performance and contributions to the University are the major influence on personnel actions.

6. Disclosure of Ratings to the Faculty

The evaluation process becomes more meaningful to faculty if faculty members know not only their individual ratings, but also how they compare to others in the College. Therefore, percent distribution of overall ratings will be provided to all full-time faculty members.

C. ADMINISTRATION OF MERIT SALARY INCREMENT FUNDS

Annual merit salary funds, when available, will be distributed on the basis of average overall performance evaluations for the past three years. Merit allocation decisions for faculty with less than three years of service at the College will be based on average overall performance ratings and recommendations from Department Chairs.

D. ANNUAL RENEWAL OF CONTRACTS OF TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

Although untenured faculty on tenure-track appointments are on probationary contracts and thus, with due process subject to dismissal before tenure is granted, the presumption is that employment will be continuous and annual renewals granted (for specific deadlines for dismissal notification, see the Faculty Handbook). Mentors and Department Chairs should communicate regularly with untenured faculty, and with each other, to ensure that the faculty member's progress is satisfactory, or to recommend improvement if necessary.

Nonrenewal of nontenured, tenure-track faculty should take place only after the following procedures have been followed:

- The Department Chair makes a recommendation in writing for nonrenewal, clearly specifying the reasons for this recommendation.
- The faculty member may respond, in writing, to the Department Chair's recommendation, limiting his/her comments to specific issues raised and adhering to a 2-page maximum length.
- Both the Department Chair's recommendation and the faculty member's response are forwarded to the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee, which makes an independent recommendation in writing. All these documents are then forwarded to the Dean for final action.

E. MID-TENURE (THIRD-YEAR) REVIEW

1. Purpose

The third-year review is a major evaluation of untenured faculty in tenure-track positions that normally is conducted during the annual review in the spring of the faculty member's third year of appointment. The purpose of the review is to provide faculty with information about the status of their progress toward promotion and tenure. The review process should provide an

objective review and assessment of the faculty member's performance to date. The review should include feedback focused on enhancing the likelihood of promotion and tenure for the faculty member.

2. Procedures

The following procedures must be observed in the third-year review.

- A third-year review committee of peers should be appointed by the Department Chair from the membership of the Tenure and Promotion Committee of the Department. It is recommended that the committee include recently tenured faculty. This committee should be formed by March 15.
- Each new faculty is assigned a Mentor. The Mentor and the committee Chair should be available to assist with the preparation of the portfolio to be submitted for review.
- The portfolio for the third-year review should be the same as the one for promotion and tenure, with the exception of letters from external peer reviewers. Faculty will submit copies of their previous annual reviews. The portfolio should be submitted to the Department Chair by March 15.
- Deliberations and discussions of portfolios will take place in committee meetings. Each candidate's accomplishments should be evaluated with respect to quality as well as quantity within the context of the candidate's roles and responsibilities.

3. Review Criteria

- The review criteria for the quality of a faculty member's three-year accomplishments should be the same as those used for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. The criteria relate to the College's tripartite mission of teaching, intellectual contributions/scholarship, and service. The candidate should also demonstrate willingness to work with colleagues in supporting the goals and missions of the Department, College, and University.
- By the third year, the candidate should demonstrate evidence of satisfactory progress toward meeting promotion and tenure criteria.

4. Feedback

- The Chair of the Department committee will prepare a written report based on the recommendation of the committee members that is submitted to the Department Chair. The report should specify the College and Department criteria and discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member's accomplishments in various areas. The report should provide meaningful feedback and direction to the faculty member to assist in planning and organizing subsequent work activities. The committee report is due by April 2.
- The report will be forwarded to the faculty member, who has an opportunity to respond in writing to the factual statements in the report. This response must only address points of inaccuracy, be limited to 2 pages, and must be received by the Department Committee Chair within four working days. Once the faculty response is received, the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee may choose to amend its original report.
- The Department Chair will also prepare a written report that discusses the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member's accomplishments. The Department Chair's report will include a recommendation regarding contract renewal.

- The two reports will be forwarded to the Dean's office, and a copy will be sent to the faculty member by no later than April 10. The Dean will meet with the candidate to discuss the results of the third-year review.
- To complete the third-year review, the faculty member may write a brief statement in response to the reports and discussions in order to address any concerns and/or to outline processes by which these concerns could be addressed.

F. DECISIONS CONCERNING GRADUATE FACULTY STATUS

1. Doctoral Faculty Status

To be eligible for this category, an individual faculty member must have been judged to meet the standard for Graduate Member status as defined by the Graduate School. In addition, the material qualifying the individual for Graduate Faculty status must include at least one article appearing in a journal designated by the respective area faculty as a "B" category journal or higher.

Doctoral Faculty is eligible to teach Ph.D./Master's classes. They may serve as dissertation committee members but may not chair dissertations. The designation of Doctoral Faculty status, once awarded, will remain in force until the concurrent Graduate Faculty status awarded by the Graduate School expires. At that time, the faculty member is encouraged to re-apply for both designations.

Faculty whose scholarly research does not meet this standard may apply for an exception in cases where their scholarly research productivity includes nationally recognized published proceedings, book, or other equivalent work whose quality is judged to be at least equal to that of their area "B" category journals. In these cases, it is the responsibility of the petitioning faculty member to provide evidence of external validation to support the claim of equivalent quality for the item(s) in question. Examples of such evidence might include acceptance rates, citation index figures, or any other quantitative or reputational evidence. The Council for Graduate Studies and Research will be the body responsible for making the final determination on the merits of the petition for exception.

2. Doctoral Mentors

To be eligible for this category, an individual faculty member must have been judged to meet the standard for Graduate Member faculty status as defined by the Graduate School. In addition, the material qualifying the individual faculty member for Graduate Faculty status must include at least one article appearing in a journal designated by the respective area faculty as an "A" category journal or higher.

The procedure for consideration of exceptions described above (under Doctoral Faculty) would be followed for this membership category.

Doctoral mentors are eligible to teach Ph.D. classes and Ph.D./Master's classes, serve as dissertation committee members, and chair dissertations. The designation of doctoral mentor status, once awarded, will remain in force until the concurrent Graduate Faculty status awarded

by the Graduate School expires. At that time, the faculty member is encouraged to re-apply for both designations.

3. Full Graduate Faculty Status

Full Graduate Faculty status is awarded to that faculty who:

- Hold an earned terminal degree or equivalent.
- Have published an average of one refereed article or equivalent per year over the previous six years (including years prior to appointment to the faculty). A faculty member who meets the criteria (six articles) prior to having been on the faculty for six years can be granted full graduate faculty status. Equivalencies might include books, book chapters, and, in exceptional circumstances, refereed conference proceedings, depending on the nature, quality, and visibility of the activities. In keeping with the conviction that quality of intellectual contributions/scholarship is more important than mere quantity of publication, fewer publications in top-level outlets can reduce the number of publications needed to satisfy this criterion.
- Are active in graduate education through activities such as the following: teaching graduate courses, serving on graduate student committees, and advising.

4. Associate Graduate Faculty Status: Associate Graduate Faculty status is awarded to that faculty approved by the College's Graduate Council to teach Masters' level courses and serve on dissertations. No minimum publication level is required to receive such appointment. This status is conferred upon faculty members who:

- Hold a terminal degree or equivalent.
- Show significant promise in research/scholarly production.

IV. TENURE AND PROMOTION

Tenure is awarded only by positive action by the Board of Regents, pursuant to the requirements and procedures at The University of Memphis. The awarding of tenure is a recognition of the merit of the faculty member that he or she meets the long-term staffing needs of the College and the institution. It is only awarded to those members of the faculty who have exhibited professional excellence and outstanding abilities sufficient to demonstrate that their future services and performances justify the degree of permanence afforded by academic tenure. Consistent with University policy, in addition to the performance review, the administrative assessment of need, enrollment trends, financial resources, rank distribution, and other such matters may be considered at the University level in the final recommendation to promote or tenure.

A new, full-time faculty member in a tenure-track position at The University of Memphis, whose services are satisfactory and continue to be needed, may be reappointed one academic year at a time for a maximum probationary period of six (6) years. As faculty members begin year six of a probationary period, they must make application for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor if they have not already attained that rank. (Exceptions to the minimum probationary period may be made under special circumstances upon recommendation by the President and the Chancellor and approval of the Board; the minimum probationary period may be reduced by credit for prior service if agreed to by the President and confirmed in writing at the time of the

initial appointment.) Faculty members with the rank of Instructor or Assistant Professor and not approved for tenure will not have their contracts renewed at the end of the probationary period. However, they will be rehired for the following year on a one-year, nonrenewable contract.

Promotion from one academic rank to a higher one is a recognition of an individual's achievement and an expression of confidence that the individual is capable of assuming additional responsibilities and demonstrating greater accomplishments. The policy of the College is to recommend promotion objectively, equitably, and impartially on the basis of merit. The section below outlines the procedure which a faculty member should follow in preparing and applying for promotion and tenure.

[NOTE: Candidates for tenure must meet eligibility requirements for promotion to Associate Professor or have already attained that rank. Because the preparation and review of applications for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor (necessary for tenure) and for promotion alone follow the same procedural steps, they are considered together in the following section.]

A. PORTFOLIOS

Candidates prepare portfolios in consultation with the candidate's Mentor and at least one other senior faculty member. The portfolio should, at a minimum, include:

- The initial contract of employment,
- Supporting documentation that the College guidelines for promotion and/or tenure have been met,
- A curriculum vita, and
- Annual reviews and the Mid-tenure review.

B. EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW

Both tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or Full Professor require external peer review consisting of the following process. (This does not apply to individuals receiving these ranks or tenure upon being hired by the University.)

1. The candidate and the Department Chair (in consultation with the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee) will develop a list of at least eight names of peer reviewers from outside the University. For this purpose, four names will be suggested by the candidate and four by the Department Chair. The final list of eight must be mutually acceptable by the candidate and the Department Chair, and each may remove names from the list for cause. For each name on the final list of eight, there should be a brief accompanying paragraph identifying the credentials of the reviewer and a statement regarding the nature of the relationship to the candidate (if any). No more than one member of the final list can be a co-author with the candidate, and no more than one can be a member of the candidate's dissertation committee. The candidate and the Department Chair contact the external reviewers in their respective lists to secure consent. The deadline for submission of the external review list is September 1, which dictates that the list should be developed during the spring prior to the application year for tenure or promotion.
2. The Department Tenure and Promotion Committee, in consultation with the Department Chair, will select four names from the list of eight, at least two of which must be from the candidate's original list. (If more reviewers are needed due to nonresponse, they should be

chosen from the original list of eight. In the event that list is exhausted, additional reviewers should be chosen from another list developed in the manner described above.) Every effort will be made to minimize biases for or against the candidate when selecting qualified peers. The credentials of the reviewer and a statement regarding the nature of the relationship to the candidate (if any) will accompany each review throughout the process.

3. All solicited letters received by the deadline will be part of the tenure and promotion materials at all stages of review. A minimum of four external reviews should be included in the candidate's promotion and tenure file. It is the responsibility of the Department Chair to follow up on outstanding requests.
4. Peer reviewers will not be paid to perform the reviews.
5. Peer reviewers who have agreed to write letters of review will be sent the following information:
 - A copy of the College tenure and promotion guidelines.
 - The candidate's Curriculum Vita.
 - Two publications chosen by the candidate to represent the quality of the candidate's research.
 - A letter from the Department Chair to the reviewer, to include the deadline for a written response (usually October 15) to the question: "In view of the accompanying guidelines regarding tenure and promotion in our College, how do you assess the quality of the scholarly activity of the candidate?" and a note that the state of Tennessee has an Open Records Law and that the candidate will have access to the outside peer reviews. A sample standard letter is provided in the Appendix.

C. THE APPLICATION PROCESS

Faculty participation in the tenure and promotion process is required. On both the Department and College levels, committees function in advisory capacities; the authority to make College recommendations rests with the Dean; it may not be delegated. The application process consists of the following elements:

1. Department Committee

The Tenure and Promotion Committee of the Department consists of all tenured Associate Professors and tenured Full Professors. For promotion to Full Professor, the subcommittee of tenured Full Professors will make the recommendations. Note: For small Departments, some alternate process may be needed. The Department Chair is ineligible to serve on the Tenure and Promotion Committees. The committee's primary function is to consider the substance of a faculty member's qualifications for tenure and/or promotion, ensuring that the candidate has met the minimum criteria.

- a. The Department Chair is responsible for placing the letters from external reviewers in the candidate's file, completing the dossier. At the time of the first Department Tenure and Promotion Committee meeting at which applicants are considered, the candidate's dossier is closed. There may be no further additions to or deletions from the submitted materials while the candidate is under consideration within the college. Note: Recommendations made by the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee, the Department Chair, the College Tenure and Promotion Committee, and the Dean are not considered additions to the portfolio.

- b. The committee deliberates and prepares a written recommendation regarding the candidate's application. The recommendation will clearly assess the candidate's qualifications and indicates whether the candidate meets the Department, College, and University criteria for promotion and/or tenure. The Committee's recommendation should reflect the full scope of discussions that took place in the Committee meetings and should also contain the rationale for the recommendation that is consistent with the vote of the Committee. The recommendation and the results of the Committee's vote (anonymous) will be forwarded to the Department Chair.

If the Department Chair is being considered for promotion or tenure, the recommendation of the Department Committee will be transmitted directly to the Dean's office.

2. Department Chair

The Department Chair will evaluate the candidate's dossier and make an independent written recommendation. The recommendation will clearly assess the candidate's qualifications and indicate whether the candidate meets the Department, College, and University criteria for promotion and/or tenure.

- In cases that involve promotion only, the Department Chair will meet with the candidate to transmit the recommendation and vote of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee, the recommendation of the Department Chair, and the reasons for those recommendations.
- In cases that involve tenure (or tenure and promotion), the Department Chair will meet with the candidate to transmit the recommendation and vote of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee and the recommendation of the Department Chair, but the reasons for the recommendations will not be addressed.

Applications for promotion may be withdrawn at this point.

The Department Chair will forward his or her written recommendations along with the written recommendations of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee and the Chair to the Dean's office for consideration by the College Tenure and Promotion Committee.

3. College Committee

The College Promotion and Tenure Committee consist of one elected representative from each of the six Departments plus three at-large members who are appointed by the Dean. Those individuals selected to the College Tenure and Promotion Committee must be tenured Full Professors. In accordance with the University's Faculty Handbook statement on single participation, a member of the College Tenure and Promotion Committee may vote at the Department level, but cannot vote at the College level on candidates from his/her department. Also, spouses of candidates may not participate in committee deliberations at any level. The Tenure and Promotion Committee has the responsibility to oversee Department-initiated actions to ensure that appropriate documentation has been provided for all recommendations and that all established tenure and promotion policies and procedures have been followed.

The committee considers the substance of a faculty member's qualifications for tenure and/or promotion and evaluates the performance of a candidate in light of the standards in this document. The committee deliberates and prepares a written recommendation regarding the candidate's application. The recommendation will clearly assess the candidate's qualifications and indicates whether the candidate meets the Department, College, and University criteria for promotion and/or tenure. The Committee's recommendation should reflect the full scope of discussions that took place in the Committee meetings and should also contain the rationale for the recommendation that is consistent with the vote of the Committee. The recommendation and the results of the Committee's vote (anonymous) will be forwarded to the Dean. If the Dean is being considered for promotion or tenure, the recommendation of the College Committee will be transmitted directly to the Provost.

In addition to the review of the candidates, the committee reviews policies and procedures on faculty promotion and tenure and makes recommendations on any changes needed.

4. Dean

The Dean will evaluate the candidate's dossier and make an independent written recommendation. The recommendation will clearly assess the candidate's qualifications and indicate whether the candidate meets the Department, College, and University criteria for promotion and/or tenure.

- In cases that involve promotion only, the Dean will meet with the candidate to transmit the recommendation and vote of the College Tenure and Promotion Committee, the recommendation of the Dean, and the reasons for those recommendations.
- In cases that involve tenure (or tenure and promotion), the Dean will meet with the candidate to transmit the recommendation and vote of the College Tenure and Promotion Committee and the recommendation of the Dean, but the reasons for the recommendations will not be addressed.

Applications for promotion may be withdrawn at this point.

The Dean will forward the written recommendations of the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee, the Department Chair, the College Tenure and Promotion Committee, and the Dean to the Provost.

The next steps in the process are also explained in the Faculty Handbook.

5. Provost

The Provost will review the file from an even broader perspective than that used in the College. In addition to and exclusive of individual qualifications and performance, consideration must be given here to such matters as Department imbalance in rank distribution, potential for continued staff additions, prospective retirements and resignations, enrollment patterns, program changes, and other significant institutional considerations.

The Provost will notify the candidate of the recommendation that will be made to the President no later than seven (7) days after the beginning of the spring semester. If a candidate decides to

appeal a negative decision for tenure and promotion, he/she must make application to the Chair of the University Tenure and Promotion Appeals Committee within thirty (30) days of the beginning of the spring semester. In the case of a negative recommendation for tenure, the Provost gives the candidate written reason(s) for the decision.

6. University Tenure and Promotion Appeals Committee

Each year a pool of 18 faculty members is formed to hear tenure and promotion appeals. Ten of the members are appointed by the Faculty Senate and eight are appointed by the President. The pool should reflect diversity in terms of race, gender, and college/school. Membership on the Committee is for three years with staggered terms to ensure conformity and continuity in the committee function.

Nine members of the pool will be assigned to hear each case, with the work being divided as evenly as possible. To the extent practicable, the committees should maintain diversity in actual participation, especially if issues of diversity play a role in a particular case.

The responsibility of this committee is to entertain appeals of negative recommendations concerning tenure and/or promotion by the Provost and to be advisory to the President in such matters. The committee may review information related to the appeal to whatever extent it wishes and then make its recommendations to the President.

[NOTE: No faculty member can participate or vote in deliberations involving the same individual at more than one tenure and promotion committee level in a given academic year.]

7. President

After receiving the recommendation from the Provost and the University Appeals Committee, the President makes final recommendations to the Tennessee Board of Regents and notifies the candidate of this recommendation. In the case of a negative recommendation, The President gives the candidate written reason(s) for the decision. (A faculty member whose tenure application has been explicitly denied cannot reapply for tenure.)

8. Regents

After considering the President's recommendation, the Regents will take final action on the application and report its decision to the President, who then sends official notification to the candidate.

D. Criteria

The quality of the faculty of any University is maintained primarily through the appraisal, by competent faculty and administrative officers, of each candidate for tenure and/or promotion. This process begins at the Department level and requires an understanding of the objectives and aims, not only of the Department, but also of the College and University. Criteria to aid in making these appraisals have been formulated by the University, the Tennessee Board of Regents, and the individual Departments. The criteria described in this section are consistent with the policy of the University and the Regents but are tailored to the demands of business education. These guidelines should be distributed to all faculties when they join the faculty, when they come up for third-year review, and when they apply for tenure and promotion.

In addition to these academic criteria, administrative criteria such as enrollment patterns and trends, curricular changes, program development, financial consideration, rank distribution, etc., are used in tenure and promotion considerations. Therefore, a decision to deny tenure or deny promotion does not necessarily mean that one's work or conduct has been unsatisfactory.

Faculty members on tenure-track appointments will not be subject to substantial revisions in the criteria for tenure if these revisions occur during the faculty member's probationary period. However, all procedural guidelines would be those in place at the time of the application for tenure (per Faculty Senate Announcement on January 30, 2013). When faculty members apply for promotion to Full Professor, they do so under the criteria currently in effect.

Generally, faculty members will receive credit for publications prior to joining the faculty in consideration for tenure or promotion. However, a continuing stream of research is expected in quality publications with an expected average of at least one article per year in high-quality journals while on the Fogelman College faculty.

The review criteria relate to the College's stated missions: teaching, (including advising/mentoring), intellectual contributions/scholarship (including support), and service/outreach. These activities are interrelated and may span more than one mission.

1. Teaching

Effective teaching is an essential qualification for tenure and/or promotion, neither of which will be granted in the absence of clear evidence of a candidate's teaching ability and potential for continued development. Excellence in teaching is highly desirable for both tenure and promotion, though it cannot be considered in isolation from other missions. Documentation of teaching should include: a statement of teaching philosophy, instructional materials, technological innovations, and student perceptions of teaching effectiveness (SETE) for each course each semester, plus any other information the faculty member feels is indicative of teaching performance.

Advising and mentoring are desirable activities that are encouraged. Any evidence of supervision of dissertations or other student projects, advising students, and other forms of mentorships should be provided.

2. Intellectual Contributions/Scholarship (of Application, of Inquiry, of Integration, of Teaching): Candidates for tenure and/or promotion must present evidence of their research and scholarly activities. Such evidence should cite books, journal articles, monographs, creative activity, and must accompany the application for promotion and/or tenure. The intellectual contributions/scholarship of teaching is not synonymous with teaching. It involves organizing, recording, and documenting teaching efforts in such a way that colleagues may share their contributions to the art of teaching. Evidence may include textbooks or educational articles and innovative contributions to teaching, if published or presented in a peer-reviewed forum, constitute intellectual contributions/scholarship of teaching.

The publication of research in refereed journals or media of similar quality is considered a reliable indication of scholarly ability. Evidence of national recognition is considered

the most important criterion in evaluating intellectual contributions/scholarship for promotion to Professor. Evidence of potential for national recognition is considered the most important criterion in evaluating intellectual contributions/scholarship for promotion to Associate Professor. Professional scholarly papers presented at international, national, or regional meetings may be appropriate. Books published by reputable firms and articles in refereed journals, reviewed by recognized scholars, are more significant than those which are not subjected to such rigorous examination. It should be emphasized that quality is more important than mere quantity.

The qualitative guidelines described below apply consistently to annual reviews and promotion/tenure decisions.

Assumptions Pertaining to Intellectual Contributions/Scholarship Review Guidelines

- All publications and presentations are not equal.
- Quality of production is more important than quantity.
- None of the areas of intellectual contributions/scholarship (of Application, of Inquiry, of Integration, of Teaching) is more valued than another.
- Peer recognition is the most important criterion in evaluating intellectual contributions/scholarship.
- Unconditionally accepted manuscripts shall be treated as publications provided documentation from the journal editor is provided.

Journals

Publication outlets include the overlapping categories of academic and professional journals. Both scholarly and professional journals enhance the visibility of the individual, the College, and the University. In assigning subjective weights to articles, distinctions will be made on the basis of the prestige of the journal and selection rigor rather than by classification according to scholarly/professional lines.

Certain journals are immediately recognizable by academics as prestige publication outlets for their respective disciplines. However, obtaining agreement on a specific, qualitative ordering of publication outlets is difficult. Many Departments encompass various subdisciplines (for example, accounting includes the subdisciplines of auditing, taxation, systems, financial accounting, and managerial accounting.) Publication opportunities for subdisciplines often are discrepant. Attempting to weigh the relative merits of the leading journals can be quite problematic and the emergence of new journals limits the longevity of any journal ranking. Although it is challenging to eliminate the subjectivity inherent in the review process, department journal listings should be updated on a regular basis by department faculty and be reflective of those adopted by peer and aspirant peer schools, as per AACSB requirements.

Journals are classified on the basis of the following categories:

- A+** This category comprises the Department's top journals, easily recognized as such by those in the Department's disciplines.

- A** This category comprises the Department's prestigious journals. These journals are rigorously refereed. Publication in these quality journals provides obvious visibility within the academic community. Examples within a discipline include major general interest journals and the top journals of the Department's subdisciplines.
- B** This category comprises well-regarded journals offering excellent national exposure. Selection must be blind refereed or by stringent editorial evaluation.
- C** This category comprises recognized outlets offering good exposure. Selection typically is refereed or by editorial evaluation.

Each Department will develop, and periodically revise, at least every three years, an externally validated categorization of journals in keeping with the categories described above, **A+**, **A**, **B**, and **C**. Categorizations for each Department must be determined by published rankings, citation analysis, authorship representations by recognized research institutions, or some other externally validated methods to be chosen by the Department. The journal listing must be approved by a vote of the Department faculty, be consistent with external accreditation criteria, and be made readily available prior to each academic year.

The majority of top-rated published papers are expected to be in the journals of a candidate's own discipline or of a closely allied discipline. In general, papers published in journals that are rated by another department in the Fogelman College are treated as equivalent to the rating of the faculty member's home department. However, in the case that a journal appears on both the list of a faculty member's home department and that of another FCBE department, the ranking in the home department's list will prevail. Papers published in journals outside the college should be judged by the department faculty with consideration of the opinion/rating of the outside department and relevance to the mission of the home department (this judgment may be made by individual departments in advance regarding outside disciplines and journals). Articles published in **A+** journal will receive the most credit in the review process. **A** journals will receive much more credit than those published in **B** journals. **B** journals will receive much more credit than those published in **C** journals.

Presented papers that are published in a scholarly journal of the association to which it is presented will be evaluated as journal articles. Other refereed proceedings typically receive less consideration in the review process than journal articles. They should, however, be evaluated in light of the contribution they make to the field. It is possible, for example, that proceedings at a prestigious conference might make a greater contribution than a lesser journal.

Books, Monographs, and Research Grant Reports

Like journal articles, textbooks, research books, grant proposals and reports, and scholarly trade books are considered as significant factors in evaluating intellectual contributions/scholarship. Quality should be evaluated in light of content, audience, the reputation of the publisher, the developmental review process, and market acceptance. Subsequent editions, too, denote peer recognition and bring visibility to the University.

Software, study guides, book chapters, case books, test banks, and other ancillaries should be evaluated as intellectual contributions/scholarship of teaching in light of qualitative characteristics, national visibility, and critical review.

Support

External and internal grants are supported and encouraged. Their contributions will be evaluated in light of their source and the net contribution to the resources of the College.

Information Technology

Innovation in instructional technology is encouraged, recognized, and considered in the review process. For instance, the intellectual contributions/scholarship of teaching can encompass technological innovation. The extent to which such activities are favorably evaluated depends on the nature, extent, and peer recognition of the innovations. Activities without peer recognition are considered teaching activities.

Research in Progress

Research in progress denotes commendable productive activity. A faculty member with significant research in progress should be evaluated more favorably than one without evidence of research effort. However, given the basic tenet that visibility is the most important criterion in evaluating research, unpublished research should receive far less credit than publications. Evidence of research in progress in decreasing order of significance includes:

- Submissions under second or third review

- New submissions (accepted by the editor for review)

- Working papers circulated for review and presentations at workshops

Coauthorship

Cooperative effort fosters a creative and productive research environment. Sharing of research ideas and effort should be encouraged. Co-authors, in general, will receive full and equal credit for a publication with multiple authors. However, evidence of intellectual leadership in some of the top-rated publications is required both for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, and for promotion to Full Professor.

3. Service

Institutional Service

Institutional service refers to work other than teaching and intellectual contributions/scholarship done at the Department, College, or University level. A certain amount of such service is expected of every faculty member; indeed, the University could hardly function without conscientious faculty who perform committee work and other administrative responsibilities. However, service expectations are less in the earlier stages of the faculty member's career. Institutional service includes, but is not limited to, serving on Department committees, advising students, and participating in College and University committees.

Professional Service

Professional service refers to the work done for organizations related to one's discipline or to the teaching profession generally. Service to the profession includes, for example, association leadership, journal editorships, article and grant proposal review, and other appropriate activities. While it is impossible to define the exact nature of significant professional service, clearly more is required than organizational membership and attendance. Some examples of significant service would be that done by an officer of a professional organization, participation on committees, reviewing articles for journals, and editorships.

Outreach

Outreach includes public service to the community and society at large, with major emphasis on the application of knowledge for the solution of problems with which society is confronted. Outreach primarily involves sharing professional expertise and should directly support the goals and mission of the College and University. A vital component of the University's mission, outreach and public service must be performed at the same high levels of quality that characterize the teaching and intellectual contributions/scholarship activities. Outreach can be characterized as public service activities for which a faculty member is qualified on the basis of his/her academic credentials.

External Funds

The generation of external funds that contribute to the mission of the College or University are important activities. Their contributions will be evaluated in light of the source and the net contribution to the resources of the College.

4. Minimum requirements for initial appointments and promotion have been devised by the Tennessee Board of Regents and expanded by the faculty to meet the needs of The University and the Fogelman College. Departments may choose to stipulate additional Department-specific criteria or more stringent requirements than those indicated below.

Instructor

Potential for high quality in teaching

Master's degree in the instructional discipline or closely related area

Assistant Professor

Evidence of potential ability for high quality in teaching, service, and intellectual contributions/scholarship

Earned doctorate from an accredited institution in the instructional discipline or related area or ABD status with high probability of completing the dissertation within one year

Associate Professor

Documented evidence of high quality in teaching, service, and intellectual contributions/scholarship

Earned doctorate from an accredited institution in the instructional discipline or related area plus a minimum of five years of appropriate professional experience (excluding experience concurrent with and at the same institution where the candidate studied for an advanced degree) in the instructional discipline or related area as of the time the rank becomes effective;

In the area of intellectual contributions/scholarship, promotion to associate professor and the granting of tenure requires evidence of an established and continuing research program. Such evidence normally is expected to include (i) an average of at least one article per year during the probationary period with most of these placed in A+ and A rated journals and (ii) at least one article in an A+ journal while on the faculty of the Fogelman College. However, quality is more important than quantity and multiple papers in A+ journals could compensate for a lower quantity of journal articles. The majority of top-rated published papers are expected to be in the journals of a candidate's own discipline or of a closely allied discipline. Furthermore, demonstration of intellectual leadership in some of the top-rated publications is required. If the candidate is part of an academic sub-discipline recognized a priori by the department faculty for which opportunities to publish in A+ journals are nonexistent or extremely and undeniably limited, a higher number of A level publications shall substitute for the A+ article requirement. Refereed conference presentations and proceedings, though encouraged, will not be considered equivalent to journal articles in meeting the requirements for tenure and promotion. Note: Assistant Professors applying for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor who came to the Fogelman College with post-Ph.D. faculty experience from other institution(s) at the Assistant Professor rank generally will be expected to meet the same standards as specified herein but will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, as specified in the employment documents.

Full Professor

Documented evidence of high quality in teaching, service, and intellectual contributions/scholarship;

Earned doctorate from an accredited institution in the instructional discipline or related area plus a minimum of ten years of appropriate professional experience in the instructional discipline or related area as of the time the rank becomes effective. In the area of intellectual contributions/ scholarship, promotion to full professor requires evidence of an established research program that has led to (a) a stream of high quality

publications since promotion to associate professor and (b) a national and international reputation for scholarship in the candidate's discipline. Such evidence normally is expected to include (i) an average of at least one article (or the equivalent) per year since promotion to associate professor, with most of these placed in A+ and A rated journals and (ii) at least one article in an A+ journal since promotion to associate professor and while on the faculty of the Fogelman College. However, quality is more important than quantity and multiple papers in A+ journals could compensate for a lower quantity of journal articles. The majority of top-rated published papers are expected to be in the journals of a candidate's own discipline or of a closely allied discipline. Furthermore, demonstration of intellectual leadership in some of the top-rated publications is required. If the candidate is part of an academic sub-discipline recognized a priori by the department faculty for which opportunities to publish in A+ journals are nonexistent or extremely and undeniably limited, a higher number of A level publications shall substitute for the A+ article requirement. Equivalencies might include influential, high impact, and highly visible books or book chapters, for no more than one-third of the article requirement. Refereed conference presentations and proceedings, though encouraged, will not be considered equivalent to journal articles in meeting the requirements for promotion to full professor. Note: Associate Professors applying for tenure and/or promotion to Full Professor who were hired by the Fogelman College as Associate Professors generally will be expected to meet the same standards as specified herein but will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, as specified in the employment documents.

[NOTE: The absence of teaching excellence and superior contribution to students or the absence of intellectual contribution / scholarship activities may prevent advancement to Professor. Since there is no rank higher, promotion to this rank must be made with great care. The rank is not a reward for long service; rather it is a recognition of superior achievement with every expectation of continuing contribution to the University.]

APPENDIX
Sample External Reference Solicitation Letter
for Candidates for Tenure and Promotion

The (four to eight) external review letters should provide a critical evaluation of the candidate's work rather than simply testimonials. It is recommended that the external evaluators initially be contacted by phone to determine their willingness and availability to provide these external assessments prior to sending materials.

PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL

Name
Department of
University
City, State, Zip

Dear Professor _____ :

On behalf of the Department of _____, I appreciate your willingness to serve as an external evaluator of the application of _____ for (*tenure and promotion to Associate Professor*) (*promotion to Professor*). As I indicated in our phone conversation on (*date*), external evaluations are extremely valuable in providing us with information and insight into the professional accomplishments of our faculty. Your evaluation will become a part of Professor _____'s dossier and will be a significant element in the review process and subsequent recommendation(s) from the Department to the Dean of the College and to the Provost.

Promotion and tenure decisions at the University of Memphis require the evaluation of a candidate's teaching, research, and service. To aid you in this appraisal, I have included *his/her* current vita and samples of key publications. I ask that you provide a candid evaluation of *his/her* scholarship, *his/her* professional reputation nationally and internationally, and *his/her* potential for continued success in his/her discipline. We are especially interested in the quality of the candidate's scholarly activity in view of the accompanying guidelines for tenure and promotion. Also, please feel free to include any additional information you believe would help us in evaluating Professor _____ for promotion and/or tenure.

Please be aware that Tennessee's Open Records Law allows individuals to request and receive access to external and internal letters in candidate tenure and promotion files. Finally, could you please enclose a copy of your curriculum vita with your evaluation? This information will be a part of Professor _____'s file. We will need your evaluation and vita not later than (*date*). To facilitate your response, I have enclosed a self-addressed, stamped envelope.

I realize that this request places an added burden on your busy schedule. However, I believe that you understand the importance of the entire process. Your efforts on behalf of

Annual Review of Faculty, Tenure, and Promotion

Professor _____ and The University of Memphis are greatly appreciated. If you have any questions regarding this request, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Name

Department Chair

Enclosure