

Promotion Standards

Introduction

Promotion, including the granting of tenure, has long-term implications for the departments within the College of Business & Economics (CoBE), the CoBE itself, and the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater. It is the responsibility of the department to be involved with tenure-track faculty members at each step of the promotion process. This can be accomplished via the University's *Purple Book* and the annual goal-setting process as articulated in each faculty member's *Document of Intent*.

Standards

The College of Business & Economics (CoBE) strives to demonstrate and support individual faculty members' unique style, talents, strengths, and professional contributions while simultaneously supporting the goals and missions of the CoBE and University. Promotion standards embrace Boyer's teacher-scholar model and its overarching criteria. Thus, a candidate's work must:

- reflect the possession of a thorough knowledge of the candidate's discipline,
- exhibit methods, procedures, and/or resources appropriate to the candidate's discipline,
- produce significant results, and
- be effectively communicated, including evidence of well-defined professional goals.

Candidates must provide a narrative that specifically ties their contributions in teaching, research and other scholarly activities, and service to the mission and standards of their departments and the CoBE. Departments must provide a narrative that ties the faculty member's teaching, research and other scholarly activities, non-teaching assignments, and service to the mission and standards of the department, CoBE, and University. In addition, departments must provide appropriate *indicators of quality* in all four areas. Assessment for promotion and/or tenure will be based on (a) the minimum standards set forth in the accompanying table and (b) the qualitative assessment in each area provided by the department. (Note: Merely meeting the minimum quantitative standards does not guarantee promotion or tenure, without the appropriate qualitative support of the department and CoBE.)

Teaching. Teaching, including advising, is the primary responsibility of faculty members in the CoBE. As often as possible, the standard classification of performance data (UW-Whitewater *Policies and Procedures*) should be used for all performance reviews, including promotion and tenure decisions. While it is not expected that all performance data items will be part of a candidate's portfolio (i.e., *Purple Book*), all of the items listed below are eligible for inclusion. However, CoBE standards require both (1) student evaluations of teaching and (2) peer reviews of teaching.

Teaching and Advising

(Adapted from UW-Whitewater's Standard Classification of Performance Data)

- **Instructional Methodology**
 - Course syllabi
 - Student participation
 - Presentation of material
 - Communication with students
 - Testing/evaluation/grading
- **Service to Students**
 - Advising and mentoring students
 - Supervision of student research projects
 - Supervision of independent study
 - Assistance with job or graduate school placement
- **Enhancement of Teaching Skills**
 - Participation in programs for improving teaching
 - Peer consultation or mentoring
 - Team teaching
 - Faculty exchanges
 - Observation of master teachers
 - Student performance on assessments
 - Innovation in at least one of the following areas: teaching, advising, curriculum development, or other teaching related responsibilities (required for promotion to full professor)
- **Student Performance**
 - Student performance on assessments
- **Support for Department Goals**
 - Curriculum development
 - Off campus teaching
 - Participation in distance education
- **Course Load**
 - Courses taught
 - Class size
 - Number of preparations
 - Course level
 - Types of courses taught: major, required, elective
- **Grants** for the improvement of teaching
- Department, constituency, university and UW-System **awards for excellence** in teaching
- **Recognition** of teaching by discipline-related professional organizations

Job Performance in Non-Teaching Assignments

- (a) Within Department: An appropriate committee (e.g., Merit, Personnel, Chair's Advisory, Ad Hoc, etc.) will evaluate the candidate's record of effectiveness in

- professional effort and responsibility in the non-teaching assignment (e.g., department chair, program coordinator, etc.) and assign a rating of outstanding, excellent, good, acceptable, or no merit. The committee must provide a narrative with a rating, at least biennially, that ties the faculty member's performance in the non-teaching assignment to the mission and standards of the department, CoBE, and University.
- (b) Outside the Department: An appropriate committee (e.g., Administrative Council, Ad Hoc, etc.) or entity will evaluate the candidate's record of effectiveness in professional effort and responsibility in the non-teaching assignment (e.g., department chair, program coordinator, etc.) and assign a rating of outstanding, excellent, good, acceptable, or no merit. The committee or entity must provide a narrative with a rating, at least biennially, that ties the faculty member's performance in the non-teaching assignment to the mission and standards of the department, CoBE, and University.

Research and Other Scholarly Activities

The teacher-scholar model reflects the importance of research and other scholarly activities in the continuing development of the university professor. The research and other scholarly activity criteria for promotion underscores the need for scholarly contributions that not only meet the numeric standards, but also represent true contributions to the knowledge based of business disciplines. In writing the narrative requesting promotion with tenure, candidates must develop a convincing argument for the importance of their research and scholarly activities. The value of the candidate's work to their respective disciplines must be demonstrated objectively with a review of their work by an "outside" reviewer with knowledge of their field. Some other objective ways to demonstrate the value of a candidates work include:

- Citations in national and international professional literature;
- Specific advances (attributed to them directly) that have results in improvements in business practices or public policy;
- Contributions to UW-Whitewater's reputation in other ways (e.g., honors, awards, or other recognitions);
- Significant organizing role for a journal's special issue(s);
- Requests for reprints, inclusion in anthologies and/or readings books, or other acknowledgements of the value of their scholarly activities.

| Publications | | Intellectual Contributions | |
|---|---|---|--|
| Applied Scholarship | Instructional Development | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Professional paper presentation •Published proceedings •Professional journal article •In-house journal article •Book review •Faculty workshop presentation •Funded grants external to UWW •Instructional software (copyrighted) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Chapter in an edited scholarly book •Research monograph •Textbook •Publication in a pedagogical journal •Written cases •Instructional materials for textbook •Law review articles |
| The application, transfer, and interpretation of knowledge to improve business practice and teaching. | The enhancement of the educational value of instructional efforts of the institution or discipline. | | |

Service. The candidate for promotion must achieve a record of professional service to their academic field of study, the academic community (i.e., department, CoBE, and university), and/or the public through various activities that take place outside the classroom. Service to a candidate’s field of study includes service to professional associations and journals.

Time spent on service activities and the significance of the service contributions are considered in the evaluation of the quality of the candidate’s service record. In general, a “significant” activity involves a minimum of (a) 10-hours of work or (b) three meetings per year. In addition, no more that 50% of a candidate’s service activities can be in any one of the subcategories presented in the table below.

In addition, the candidate must show a potential to assume a contributing role within faculty as one moves towards tenure and the rank of professor. For example, (1) promotion to Associate Professor requires meaningful service to the university community and/or academic community and (2) promotion to Professor requires service contributions that have made a recognized contribution to the betterment of the university community and/or academic community.

| University Service | | Professional Service | |
|---|--|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department committees • College committees • University committees • UW-System committees • Faculty advisor to a student organization | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contributor to department, college, or university reports (audit, accreditation, self-study, etc.) • Assigned mentor or advisor to a probationary faculty member • Other | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Editor of a professional journal • Manuscript referee • Reviewer of grant proposal for granting agency • Reviewer of promotion or personnel files for another university • Discipline related consultant • Editorial Board member | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Officer of or service to a professional association • Provider of non-credit continuing education • Presenter of in-service programs for faculty and staff • Other discipline related activity |

Approved May 2006

**Univeristy of Wisconsin - Whitewater
College of Business & Economics**

Promotion to:

| <u>Types of Decisions</u> | (1) Associate Professor With Tenure | (2) Associate Professor (Already Has Tenure) | (3) Tenure (Already Associate) | (4) Professor | (5) Tenure (Already Professor) |
|---|--|--|--|---|---|
| Categories | | | | | |
| A. Teaching | Three of last four years outstanding or excellent | Three of last four years outstanding or excellent | Three of last four years outstanding or excellent | Last three years, or 2/3 of review period, outstanding or excellent | Last three years, or 2/3 of review period, outstanding or excellent |
| B. Job Performance (if applicable) (Non-Teaching Assignments) | | | | | |
| 1. Within department | Last three years, or 2/3 of time, outstanding or excellent | Last three years, or 2/3 of time, outstanding or excellent | Last three years, or 2/3 of time, outstanding or excellent | Last three years, or 2/3 of review period, outstanding or excellent | Last three years, or 2/3 of review period, outstanding or excellent |
| 2. Outside department | Last three years, or 2/3 of time, outstanding or excellent | Last three years, or 2/3 of time, outstanding or excellent | Last three years, or 2/3 of time, outstanding or excellent | Last three years, or 2/3 of review period, outstanding or excellent | Last three years, or 2/3 of review period, outstanding or excellent |
| C. Research and Scholarly Activities | | | | | |
| <i>Publications</i> | | | | | |
| 1. Refereed articles* or cases, or (single or co-authored), or | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| 2. Refereed articles* or cases (more than two authors), or | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| 3. Scholarly Book * Includes Law Review articles | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| <i>Intellectual Contributions</i> | | | | | |
| See description in Notes to Standards | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 |
| D. Professional and Public Service | | | | | |
| (must include at least one activity in each category for the review period) | 10 Total | 10 Total | 10 Total | 15 Total | 15 Total |
| 1. University | | | | | |
| 2. Professional | | | | | |
| 3. Public | | | | | |

The standards depicted in this table represent the *minimum* quantitative requirements *to be considered* for promotion in the College of Business & Economics.
Approved May 2006

External Review Guidelines (Adopted: April 2009)

What follows is the process for selecting External Reviewers to provide reports on the research portfolio of candidates for promotion and tenure in the College of Business and Economics.

Selection process and receipt of research review

1. The candidate should select three to five External Review (ER) prospects who are established experts in the candidate's field of research expertise and submit these names to the Department Chair. Along with the names, the candidate should provide contact information and a summary of their credentials. During the process of identifying possible reviewers, the candidate may ask the department chair and other faculty to provide recommendations. The candidate is not required to accept those recommendations, though s/he must ultimately identify 3-5 ER prospects.
2. ER prospects should have an "arms'-length" relationship with the candidate to ensure their objectivity in evaluating the candidate's research. For example, they should not be co-authors or research collaborators, graduate advisors, former teachers, former colleagues, or relatives.
3. The candidate should seek guidance from the Department's Promotions Committee (DPC) in case of (a) concerns about the appropriateness of a prospect or (b) a need for names of appropriate ER prospects. In the latter case, if the DPC cannot suggest names, then it will consult with other members of the Department and, if necessary, contact extra-mural sources for possible names
4. Once the DPC has a list of names from and/or acceptable to the candidate and has confirmed arms' length relationships, it will select one or two from whom it will request a research review. It will contact the potential ER(s) and confirm their willingness to serve and meet the review deadline. It will then send the ER(s) (a) a formal letter of invitation and confirmation of their willingness to serve, (b) the candidate's CV, (c) copies of the candidate's published articles and working papers for the period under review, and (d) a summary of the University and College promotion and tenure standards, as appropriate. Instead of the DPC, the Department Chair may be the initial contact and correspondent with the ER(s).
5. The ER(s) is required to submit a timely review of the candidate's research in terms of quality and quantity relative to the University and College standards; and will be asked to submit a summary of their own qualifications for scrutiny by the Department, College, and University.

Timeline:

1. Spring semester prior to review year: Formation of list of potential ERs and confirmation of willingness to serve by one or two ERs; provision of confirming letter of invitation and candidate's materials to ER(s) by at least two weeks before the end of the Spring term.
2. Early September of review year: ER(s) provides review of candidate's research along with summary of own qualifications.
3. Fall of review year: ER review(s) included in candidate's Purple Book as of the deadline for its submission for its initial review (Department).