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### **DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP**

**APPENDIX A:**

### **PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES**

#### Tenure-Track

These guidelines describe the promotion and tenure (P&T) policy of the Department of Management and Entrepreneurship. These guidelines are meant to apply whenever the P&T process is engaged, namely, for the review of a probationary faculty, for tenure and/or promotion of an assistant professor to associate level, and for promotion of an associate professor to full professor. All actions should also conform to W. P. Carey School of Business (WPC) P&T policy as described in “Faculty Evaluation Policies, Guidelines, and Procedures” (FEPGP), and ASU policy as described in the Academic Affairs Manual (i.e., ACD policies).

# Evidence of Achievement

University policies state that “The purpose of promotion is to recognize and reward accomplishment. Promotion is awarded on the basis of proven excellence” (ACD 506-05); and similarly, “Tenure is awarded on the basis of excellence and the promise of continued excellence” (ACD 506-04). WPC policy adds that “Since tenure is conveyed with promotion to Associate Professor, it is essential that rigorous professional judgment be applied to each candidate’s petition. Concurrent granting of promotion and tenure involves a twofold evaluation of a candidate’s record. Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor recognizes the candidate’s achievements in the areas of research and publication, teaching, and institutional service, with greatest emphasis on performance in research and teaching. Granting of tenure must take into consideration not only the candidate’s past performance but expectations regarding the candidate’s continued progress toward promotion to Professor” (FEPGP, II.2). Further, “While effective teaching and institutional service are necessary, they are not sufficient conditions for promotion and tenure. A strong record of scholarly research and publication, or other creative work of a professional nature, as defined by academic units as appropriate for specific academic areas, must accompany achievement in the other areas if promotion and tenure are to follow” (FEPGP, II.2.1).

The following material is quoted from WPC policy (FEPGP, Part III: “Factors Related to the Determination of Achievement in Research and Publication, Teaching, and Service”):

III.1. Overview

Promotion and tenure are based on achievement in research and publication, teaching, and institutional service. This section provides guidelines for the determination of achievement in each of these three areas. These guidelines do not preempt variety in the activities of individuals (not all faculty will teach in the same way, perform similar research, or be involved in the same service activities) nor eliminate an academic unit’s prerogative relative to evaluative criteria. However, they do provide a common framework for discussion of faculty achievement in each of the three areas.

III.2. Research and Publication

Achievement in research and publication may be demonstrated through the development of a record of productive scholarship, supported by substantial publication and/or other original work of a professional nature. Specific types of research outlets are presented below. In some cases this listing may be too comprehensive, and in others not comprehensive enough. It records commonly used outlets for scholarly research. Each evaluative body is responsible for judging the quality of research done. This list does not imply weights regarding the value of one research outlet relative to another, beyond the preference given to recognized academic and professional journals.

The quality of a candidate’s research and publication record is best judged by his/her peers and is to be assessed by peers in the field, both from the school and from other universities, in accordance with university guidelines. While it is anticipated that individual faculty will seek a wide variety of appropriate research outlets, publication in recognized academic and professional journals in each candidate’s field is considered an integral element of an acceptable research and publication record.

In general, co-authorship shall not be viewed negatively. Assessment of the individual’s contribution to coauthored works is best achieved by the academic unit’s personnel committee.

III.2.1. Recognized Academic and Professional Journals

Recognition shall be given to both research and publications in academic and professional journals. The quality and relative importance of specific outlets will be determined within the candidate’s academic unit, but publication in leading outlets will be an integral part of all acceptable candidate records. [*Addendum by the Department Personnel Committee:* “Leading outlets” are defined by the Department’s Bylaws, specifically “Appendix B: Annual Performance Evaluation Guidelines and Post-Tenure Review Process.” Regarding publication outlets that are “outside” the management discipline, their quality may be established by a published study of journal quality, a similar list from another ASU department’s similar list, and/or the expertise of people in that discipline.]

III.2.2. Books/Monographs

The quality of the book or monograph shall be a major criterion for evaluation. Special consideration will be given to scholarly books or monographs that extend the frontiers of knowledge as compared to textbooks that compile and organize existing knowledge. Readings, edited books, and proceedings shall be given less importance than standard textbooks. In general, books and monographs are not essential for promotion and/or tenure. Textbooks, by themselves, are not sufficient for promotion and/or tenure.

III.2.3. Professional Reports

Professional publications, such as technical reports, shall be considered neither necessary nor sufficient for promotion and/or tenure. Still, their positive contribution to a candidate’s stature and reputation warrant consideration. The size and nature of a report’s audience shall be considered in evaluating its relative merit.

III.2.4. Professional Papers

Competitive papers shall be considered for promotion and tenure. The values assigned to professional papers are flexible and will be determined by such factors as: (a) the quality of the paper, (b) the nature of the competition, and (c) whether the paper was invited. In most cases, competitive or invited papers, even when published in proceedings, will not normally be considered as substitutes for articles in recognized academic and professional journals.

The actual presentation of professional papers at meetings may additionally be considered as evidence of professional service. Any overlap between the research and publication and service sections of a candidate’s vita should be clearly noted.

III.2.5. Other Publications

In some fields, case studies, prototypical software, and other types of publications provide vehicles for developing national reputations and should accordingly be considered in promotion and tenure deliberations. Such outlets, by themselves, shall be considered neither necessary nor sufficient for promotion and/or tenure.

III.2.6. Funded Research Grants

A funded research grant that is awarded on the basis of a competitive peer review process provides evidence of recognized scholarship, especially if the competition for grants is broadly based. Research awards shall carry more or less weight in evaluating a record of scholarship depending on the norms of the candidate’s field of study and the rigor of the grant program’s evaluation process. Decisions about the relevance of grants to the candidate’s research productivity are best made by department personnel committees and the importance of such grants may even vary within academic units. Research awards alone are not sufficient for promotion and/or tenure. Funded research is construed to mean grants that are explicitly awarded to further a candidate’s research productivity, and this category does not include awards for training, education or service projects, or projects funded under ‘sale of services’.

III.2.7. Research in Progress

Research in progress, in addition to research accomplished and published, is a barometer of research activity. Research in progress is obviously not a sufficient contribution for promotion and/or tenure. However, research in progress, especially on-going work on funded projects, manuscripts currently undergoing review, and formal working papers, is a useful indicator of a candidate’s progress. Research in progress that can be supported by documented evidence will be viewed more favorably than that which cannot.

III.3. Teaching Effectiveness

Effective teaching is expected of all faculty. [*Addendum by the Department Personnel Committee:* As faculty members in a leading professional school, management faculty are expected to provide education that promotes effective managerial practices and entrepreneurship consistent with the challenges to be faced by our graduates. Graduates from both our undergraduate and Masters programs will need to be team-skilled, collaborative managers with the capability to solve people and process problems, and communicate in a project-oriented, digital environment. They are likely to seek careers in a broad variety of for-profit and not-for-profit organizations in positions of increasing managerial responsibility. Ph.D. graduates need to develop research competence, teaching skills, and academic professionalism for successful careers in competitive business schools.]

The elements to be considered in judging teaching effectiveness may include, but not necessarily be limited to:

III.3.1. Student Evaluations and Other Inputs from Students

Formal student evaluations of teaching effectiveness provide evidence of teaching performance, recognizing the limitations of any evaluative instrument. Lack of formal evaluations will be viewed negatively.

III.3.2. Course Development, Outlines, and Innovative Practices

Evidence of course development will be viewed favorably. Evidence of development may include such things as course outlines and descriptions of innovative practices incorporated into classroom activities.

III.3.3. Facilitation of Student Development

Facilitation of student development may include activities such as advisement of individual students, service on graduate program committees, facilitation of student publications, attention to curriculum matters, maintenance of standards and fairness, service on dissertation committees, and Honors Program thesis and Master’s Program supervision.

III.3.4. Teaching Evaluations from Executive Education Courses

While teaching in continuing education programs such as those offered by the Center for Executive and Professional Development are generally considered as part of a faculty member’s service activities, teaching evaluations from such program offerings constitute additional evidence of teaching effectiveness.

III.3.5. Other Considerations

Several other factors contribute to the evaluation of a candidate’s teaching effectiveness. Some of these factors include: (a) course loads, (b) numbers of new and repeat course offerings, (c) graduate and undergraduate course levels, (d) class sizes, (e) the availability of grading assistance, and (f) the nature of the class (e.g., courses offered through the Center for Executive and Professional Development). The effect of these factors on a candidate’s overall teaching performance must be evaluated carefully.

III.4. Institutional Service

Institutional service encompasses those activities of the faculty other than teaching and research. Contributions will generally fall into one of three areas: collegial, professional, and community and governmental service. Activities that enhance the reputation or effectiveness of an individual faculty member may indirectly benefit the university.

Typically, however, these activities are considered within the teaching and research dimensions of the university reward system and would not receive additional consideration under the institutional service dimension. When exceptions occur, it will be the responsibility of the faculty member to demonstrate that benefits to the university have occurred and that these benefits are outside the teaching and research dimensions of the university reward system so that they merit consideration as service to the institution or the profession.

Institutional service criteria should be performance related. That is, the results of a particular activity should be emphasized whenever possible.

Good citizenship is an admirable quality deserving of recognition within the community. Nonetheless, community or civic activities normally shall not qualify as institutional service. When exceptions occur, it will be the responsibility of the faculty member to provide evidence that such activities were of direct benefit to the university or profession.

III.4.1. Collegial Contributions

The decision-making bodies shall evaluate the individual’s collegial contributions not only on the basis of degree of participation, but also on the quality of contributions. The contributions shall include, but not be limited to:

1) Committee assignments within the academic unit, school and university

2) Committee chairperson director/chair assignments

3) Program and curriculum development

4) Generation of funds from non-research activities

5) Student counseling related to course and career development

6) Projects carried out for the school or university that receive no compensation

7) Service as faculty advisor to student organization

III.4.2. Professional Contributions – Professional Organizations

Service to local, regional, and national business and professional organizations shall be considered by the decision-making bodies.

Membership in professional organizations is not sufficient to warrant a significant evaluation. Direct participation and leadership roles through offices held, speeches given, committee assignments, etc. will be the type of criteria utilized by the decision-making bodies. Professional contributions are desirable at all levels of promotion but will be considered more important for the Associate Professor to Professor promotion than for the Assistant Professor to Associate Professor promotion. Examples include:

1) Editorial activities with academic and professional journals

2) Referee for academic journals

3) Reviewer of books for academic journals or textbook publishers

4) Serving as a moderator, panel member, discussant, paper presenter, or in some other capacity at a meeting of professional associations

5) Serving as an officer or board member of a professional association

III.4.3. Professional Contributions – Consulting Activities

Consulting activities are defined as any activity, normally compensated, performed for a public or private organization, institution or association at their request. This would include, but not be limited to:

1) Giving advice

2) Designing and/or implementing policies, procedures, or methods

3) Data gathering, analysis, and reporting when it is done at the request of the organization and the results are not made public

4) Expert testimony

5) Conducting training or educational courses or seminars

Consulting activities are acceptable as institutional service only if evidence is presented to show a direct, tangible benefit to the institution and/or profession. The burden for demonstrating such benefits is upon the individual submitting the request. While consulting activities may constitute evidence of a faculty member’s professional reputation, most consulting activities will not count as institutional service.

III.4.4. Community and Governmental Contributions

Community and governmental service shall be considered desirable for promotion and/or tenure, with more importance placed on such service at the Associate Professor/Professor levels. Since the scope of such service is broad, decision-making bodies will have discretion in determining the nature and importance of community service activities. Included among the more important activities are serving on working committees and boards of directors of significant community groups, and public service volunteerism to local/national governmental agencies. A key element is that the faculty member served in a capacity as a representative of the university, not just as an individual. [*End of quotation*.]

Evidence that becomes available *during* the evaluation process by the Personnel Committee or Department Chair, whether of a positive or negative nature, should be taken into account in the decision-making process.

Review of Probationary Faculty

“Faculty appointed at the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor may receive a probationary appointment. The purpose of probation is to provide the tenure-eligible faculty member with an opportunity to develop and demonstrate the ability to meet the criteria for tenure at the institution and to provide the institution with the opportunity to evaluate the abilities of the faculty member…If an individual’s appointment begins in the spring semester, the tenure clock begins in the following fall semester” (ACD 506-03).

“In addition to the annual feedback on progress towards tenure, all probationary faculty must receive a formal probationary review midway through their probationary period (e.g., third year of a six-year probationary period, or as noted in an agreement). The purpose of the probationary review is to give faculty members multiple appraisals of their progress toward earning tenure and assess whether retention is appropriate” (ACD 506-03). The process should be very similar to that used for promotion to associate, except that external evaluation letters are not requested. There are three possible outcomes: “retained, retained conditionally, or given a terminal appointment for the succeeding year” (ACD 506-03). The Personnel Committee and Department Chair should take special effort to ensure that candidates are given constructive and candid feedback concerning their performance.

# Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor

According to university policy, “Promotion to associate professor requires an overall record of excellence and the promise of continued excellence” (ACD 506-05). More specifically, according to WPC policy, “Promotion to Associate Professor implies that the faculty member has demonstrated proficiency in scholarly research and publication and/or other creative work of a professional nature, showing evidence of development of one or more research foci, has demonstrated continuing growth as an effective teacher, and has given evidence of institutional service and the potential for continued growth in this area” (FEPGP, II.2.1).

“An Assistant Professor may apply for promotion prior to the final probationary year, which is the sixth year for persons without prior academic experience… Promotion and tenure prior to the final probationary year will require superior performance on the part of the candidate, demonstrating achievement commensurate with that of a full probationary faculty member” (FEPGP, II.2.2).

The candidate shall submit evidence as suggested above. The Department Chair is responsible for ensuring that peer evaluations (if desired) and external reviews are performed in a timely manner so that such evidence can be included in the evaluation. The Department Chair shall determine an appropriate process for performing the peer teaching evaluation(s). With regard to external letters, “Candidate submits to unit chair/director a list of at least 10 names of people he/she recommends to serve as potential external reviewers. Five of the 10 names…must be at approved peer or aspirational peer institutions” (click on the link to P5 in ACD 506-04). WPC policy adds that “These evaluators are to be persons other than ASU faculty” (FEPGP, V.2), and that the file requesting promotion/tenure include a “Grid of external reviewers’ evaluations… and vitae for each external reviewer,” along with “a sample copy of the request letter sent to outside evaluators” (FEPGP, V.2).

# Granting of Tenure to Associate Professors

Probationary associate professors are evaluated for tenure in the same manner as described above, with the exception that their record of achievement should reflect the greater length of time they have been in the profession at ASU and other universities.

# Promotion from Associate to Full Professor

University policy states that “Promotion to full professor must be based on an overall record of excellence in the performance of responsibilities” (ACD 506-05). More specifically, WPC policy states that, “In the case of promotion to Professor, the individual must have demonstrated genuine and significant achievement, as embodies [sic] in original contributions in his or her areas of work, and must have shown a commitment to high scholarship. In addition, clear evidence of academic leadership that includes nationally recognized contributions will be essential to promotion to Professor” (FEPGP, II.3). ASU defines scholarship as follows:

**“Research, Scholarship, and/or Creative Activities**

Research, scholarship, and/or creative activities are defined as intellectual work that advances the academic disciplines, has its significance validated by academic peers or other appropriate outside authorities, and is communicated to peers or other appropriate persons. Such work in its diverse forms (e.g. publications, juried exhibitions/performances) is based on a high level of professional expertise, is original, is documented and validated through peer review or critique, and is communicated in appropriate ways so as to have an impact on or significance for the discipline itself or for publics beyond the university. Research and creative activities encompass all scholarly work, including the scholarship of discovery, integration, application, and instruction” (ACD 202-01).

Regarding academic leadership, WPC policy states: “Academic leadership may be shown through the number and quality of journal articles, as service as the principal investigator in join research projects, receipt of competitive, peer reviewed sponsored research grants and projects, leadership and participation in professional conferences, course and program development, and service as the chair of major committees. In addition, the number and quality of technical reports and presentations, leadership in professional and technical activities, etc., may serve as evidence of nationally recognized contributions” (FEPGP, II.3).

Non-meritorious performance in teaching or service/institutional commitment does not constitute an overall record of excellence, regardless of contributions in scholarship/research. Non-meritorious performance in scholarship/research does not constitute an overall record of excellence, regardless of contributions in service/institutional commitment and/or teaching.

# Hiring of Senior Faculty

In general, if a person has achieved tenure and/or a specific rank at a “peer university” (or better), this can be considered as sufficient evidence of achievement for similar tenure and/or rank in the Department. If a person who is not tenured at their current institution is being offered a tenured position, and/or a person who is an associate professor at their current institution is being offered the rank of full professor, then the Personnel Committee may request the candidate provide evidence as required by the normal evaluation process, as outlined above.

#### Non-Tenure Track

The following material is excerpted (with minor modifications) from WPC policy (FEPGP, II.6: “Appointment, Retention and Promotion of Clinical Faculty, Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, and Other Faculty Ranks”):

Clinical faculty have an earned doctorate. In contrast, faculty without a doctorate who focus on a teaching career hold lecturer ranks, and people with extensive business experience, either with or without doctorates, who plan to teach for only a few years are appointed as professors of practice. Clinical faculty, lecturers, and professors of practice are not eligible for tenure. Contracts for these faculty may be either nine-month or twelve-month.

1. Initial appointment of lecturers or clinical assistant ranks may be filled through either a local or national search.
2. Initial appointment of advanced rank non-tenure track faculty must be made through a national search.
3. Application for and promotion to advanced rank for non-tenure track faculty should follow W. P. Carey School promotion procedures and time schedules established by the university.

# Minimum Criteria for Clinical Faculty

All clinical faculty in the W. P. Carey School must meet the following minimum criteria:

1. Earned doctorate in a related field.
2. Faculty qualifications, as defined by the W. P. Carey School of Business for AACSB accreditation purposes and as assigned by the department head.

To maintain a clinical faculty designation, the minimum criteria must be maintained.

# Criteria for Clinical Assistant Professor

Must meet the minimum criteria for all clinical faculty, but does not meet the criteria for a higher rank.

# Criteria for Clinical Associate Professor

In addition to meeting the minimum criteria for all clinical faculty, Clinical Associate Professors typically demonstrate all of the following:

1. The equivalent of five years of full-time teaching in higher education. A significant amount of this must be in courses at the four-year institution level in fields related to the W. P. Carey assignment of the faculty member. The guidelines of five years may be reduced on a case-by-case basis provided the candidate has significant scholarly research accomplishments within the discipline or substantial relevant professional experience in business.
2. Significant excellence in teaching, as demonstrated by such indicators as good teaching evaluations, preparation of innovative course materials, textbook or case publication, new course preparation, academic or practitioner-oriented publications, and successful teaching in a variety of different types or courses.
3. Active participation in service roles related to teaching. This must include a) active participation in academic unit or school committees related to instruction and b) participation in national professional activities related to the faculty member’s teaching (such as attending relevant national meetings).

# Criteria for Clinical Professor (Full)

In addition to meeting the minimum criteria for all clinical faculty, clinical full professors typically demonstrate all of the following:

1. The equivalent of 12 years of full-time teaching in higher education. A significant amount of this must be in courses at the four-year institution level in fields related to the W. P. Carey assignment of the faculty member. The guidelines of 12 years may be reduced on a case-by-case basis provided the candidate has significant scholarship/research accomplishments within the discipline or substantial relevant professional experience in business.
2. Sustained long-term excellence and diversity in teaching, as demonstrated by such indicators as good teaching evaluations, preparing of innovative course materials, textbook or case publication, new course preparation, academic or practitioner-oriented publications and successful teaching in a variety of different types of courses.
3. Demonstrated leadership in curriculum development.
4. Demonstrated leadership in service roles related to teaching. This must include a) successful leadership roles in academic unit or school committees related to instruction and b) active participation in national professional activities related to the faculty member’s teaching (such as making presentations at relevant professional meetings or serving on relevant professional committees).

# Minimum Criteria for Lecturer Ranks

All lecturers in the W. P. Carey School must meet the following minimum criteria:

1. Earned master in a related field.
2. Have teaching experience at the college level in a related field.
3. Faculty qualifications, as defined by the W. P. Carey School of Business for AACSB accreditation purposes and as assigned by the department head.

To maintain a lecturer rank designation, the minimum criteria must be maintained.

# Criteria for Lecturer

Must meet the minimum criteria for lecturer ranks, but does not meet the criteria for a higher rank.

# Criteria for Promotion of Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

A Lecturer may be considered for promotion to Senior Lecturer after a minimum of five consecutive years of teaching service have been successfully completed and reviewed.

# Criteria for Promotion from Senior Lecturer to Principal Lecturer

A Senior Lecturer is eligible to be considered for promotion to Principal Lecturer after a minimum of twelve consecutive years of service have been successfully completed and reviewed.

Candidates for promotion should present evidence of sustained and continuing excellence in teaching, service, and scholarship, including evidence regarding AACSB Faculty Qualification status. Academic units and the school will sometimes assign roles to Lecturers that vary in their emphasis on teaching, service, and scholarship contributions. The emphasis assigned to these roles by the Lecturer’s unit will be considered in the overall evaluation of performance.

1. *Teaching:* Candidates for promotion should present a record of sustained long-term excellence and diversity in teaching. Evidence of sustained excellence and diversity includes, but is not limited to, good student evaluations, teaching awards, new course development, course innovations, and successful teaching in a variety of different types of courses. Evidence of a record of continuing success in mentoring students, supervising honors theses, independent studies or internships, and advising students will also be considered. Candidates will typically present evidence of leadership in curriculum development. Candidates for promotion should summarize their record in the form of a teaching portfolio that describes their contribution to the teaching mission of their academic unit and the school, presents evidence of excellence in the areas noted above and any other areas relevant to their teaching role, and includes a statement of teaching philosophy.
2. *Service – Internal and External Contributions:* Candidates for promotion should present evidence of sustained service contributions to the mission of the academic unit, school, and/or university (internal service) and to the profession and community at large (external service). The roles assigned within his/her unit will be considered in evaluating the magnitude of accomplishment expected in service overall, and in internal and external service. Evidence of internal service contributions includes, but is not limited to, records of accomplishment and leadership in administrative roles, committee work, and advisement to student groups and individuals. Evidence of external service includes, but is not limited to, active participation and/or leadership in professional associations, representing the unit to external constituents, and professional service linking the university to the larger community.
3. *Scholarship of Teaching:* Candidates for promotion should present evidence of scholarship competence and accomplishment. Scholarly accomplishments expected of a candidate for promotion will vary by the role assigned by his/her unit. However, all candidates will present evidence of a continuing commitment to the scholarship of teaching. Such evidence includes, but is not limited to, course development, instructional innovation, membership in professional associations, participation and presentation at professional meetings (particularly those relevant to pedagogical development), and continuing education.

Promotion is warranted only if and when the achievements outlined above are tangibly demonstrated. Thus, promotion is based neither on promise nor longevity. It is natural for faculty members to vary in the time required to attain the appropriate level of achievement.

# Requests for Promotion in the Lecturer Ranks

Requests for promotion should occur at the time of the normal review and are due in the Office of the University Provost by the date set by the University. If the promotion is awarded, it will become effective during the following academic year. Promotion, regardless of length of appointment, also will be contingent upon the offer of a contract in the following academic year. Materials to be sent forward for promotion review generally include:

1. The appropriate form provided by the Office of the University Provost along with any additional forms used by the academic unit and school.
2. Evaluations by personnel committees
3. Transmittal letters of the chair/director and dean
4. Summary of teaching effectiveness, including both student and peer teaching evaluations
5. Self-assessment
6. Current curriculum vita

This file is reviewed by the Dean’s Personnel Advisory Committee which writes a memo to the dean with its recommendation. The dean then writes an independent review of the material. The entire packet is forwarded to the Office of the University Provost for final approval.