

INDIANA UNIVERSITY  
PURDUE UNIVERSITY  
AT FORT WAYNE

The Senate

*SD 88-34  
superseded by  
SD 95-4  
(10/9/95)*

*SD 88-36 superseded  
by SD 89-7  
SD 88-37 superseded  
by SD 89-2  
SD 88-41 superseded  
by SD 89-5*

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** The Senate

**FROM:** James Owen, Chair  
Agenda Committee

**DATE:** 27 March 1989

**SUBJ:** Promotion and Tenure Documents: The School of Business and Management Sciences, the School of Education, the School of Fine and Performing Arts, the School of Engineering and Technology, and the Division of Health Sciences

**DISPOSITION:** To the Presiding Officer, for implementation

*procedures in the*  
Resolved, That the Senate approve the attached documents on promotion and tenure from the School of Business and Management Sciences, the School of Education, the School of Fine and Performing Arts, the School of Engineering and Technology, and the Division of Health Sciences

**Approving**

W. Frederick  
J. Haw  
J. Lantz  
J. Owen  
E. Snyder

**Absent**

**NOTE:** Questions concerning these documents should be addressed to the schools/divisions.

BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT SCIENCES  
PROMOTION & TENURE HANDBOOK

Revised: March 21, 1989

Approved by the Faculty: \_\_\_\_\_, 1989

## I. PURPOSE AND PHILOSOPHY

The purpose of this handbook is to provide all Business & Management Sciences Departments and Faculty specific and uniform guidelines and procedures for promotion and tenure (P&T). Such internal guidelines are intended to be consistent with the Academic Handbooks of Indiana University and Purdue University as well as IPFW policy on promotion and tenure.

The handbook consists of four distinct Sections:

- A. A Code of Professional Responsibility (Ethics)
- B. Discovery of Evidence Guidelines
- C. A Uniform Policy and Procedure
- D. Criteria Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure

The philosophy of the B&MS faculty and its administration is that promotion and tenure shall be fair, consistent and uniformly attainable by qualified faculty regardless of race, sex, color, religion, national origin, age, or handicap status. Additionally, it is the belief of the faculty and administration that promotion must be earned by the achievement of excellence in one of the areas of teaching, service and/or research and competence in the remaining areas. The minimum standard for earning tenure is the demonstration of competence in all three areas.

The faculty and administration believe that the primary judgment of such attainment shall be made by peers from an applicant's discipline or a closely related discipline, and that the evidence considered and the criteria utilized shall be fair, consistent and understandable to both the candidate and evaluators. Notice of performance expectations, evaluative criteria, and the process of review shall be distributed in writing to each faculty member upon their becoming a member of the SBMS tenure track faculty. The administrative and due process reviews shall insure that all evaluations are free of bias and based upon professionally relevant evaluation of evidence.

This Handbook is intended to be both a working document in the short run and an ever-evolving assemblage of guidelines and procedures in the long term. The policies and criteria contained herein must be adaptive to the temporal dynamics of the organizational structure and missions of the various departments that comprise the School of Business and Management Sciences. In order to insure a responsive document, both the overall scope and the specific provisions of this Handbook are to be critically evaluated by a School level committee at least once every four years. Such committee will be empowered to propose formal revisions of the handbook to the faculty of the School.

## II. EFFECTIVE DATE

Untenured faculty members, whose initial appointment to a tenure track position was prior to August 15, 1988, shall have the option to be evaluated for tenure and promotion to the associate's rank under either the set of criteria contained in this document or its predecessor.

## III. HANDBOOK

### A. Code of Professional Responsibility (Ethics)

The following rules apply to the decision making of administrators and faculty members in making recommendations on personnel actions:

1. Faculty members and administrators shall be fair and consistent while reviewing and deciding personnel actions.

2. The candidate's record of evidence (Section B) shall be the sole basis for personnel decisions. The department criteria for the candidate shall be applied to the case for the final recommendation.

3. A faculty member or administrator must withdraw from the decision making process if a conflict of interest becomes apparent.

4. Complete honesty and candor is expected of faculty members and administrators in the discharge of their obligations under this policy.

5. A faculty member should refrain from evaluation of any portion of a candidate's case that he/she is not qualified to appraise.

6. Indiscriminate criticism or gossip should never be an element of the personnel decision making process.

7. Discussions and information regarding committee deliberations, reviews, and voting outcomes are to be held in confidence.

## B. Discovery of Evidence For Promotion and Tenure Cases.

Basic fairness and due process require that the discovery of evidence be completed prior to the deliberations of any decision makers concerning promotion and tenure cases. The following rules are promulgated.

The bases for evaluation of a faculty member for promotion and tenure are the following items:

1. The year end activity reports which shall be inspected by the Department Chair, together with the candidate to assure the accuracy and completeness of such reports. These annual reports shall constitute a portion of the candidate's case.

2. The candidate's departmental personnel record (such as vita, reappointment forms, reappointment recommendations, annual evaluations, and other correspondence relevant to the personnel action being considered) shall be inspected by the Department Chair, together with the candidate, to assure its completeness and accuracy. The personnel record shall be a portion of the case.

3. The Department Chair shall solicit written input regarding each case from all tenure track members of the department faculty.

4. Documented information in the possession of the Department Chair concerning the candidate's case shall be provided to the candidate at least twenty (20) working days in advance of the closing of the record. The candidate may then respond to the information, in writing, and bring information to be attached to the response. The response and its attachments must be provided to the Department Chair five (5) working days in advance of the closing of the record. The Department Chair is to consider the response and its attachments. After due consideration, the Department Chair may eliminate from his/her original information, any item appropriately settled by the response. The candidate must then be informed of eliminated information and given at least three full working days to modify his/her response. Upon completion of this process, the final responses and attachments shall be made a portion of the record.

5. The candidate may submit a candidate's statement and a consolidated summary of the evidence advocating the reasons for a favorable professional action. Should the University require such a candidate's statement and consolidated summary, then the candidate shall provide those items in accordance with University policy.

The completed case is to be submitted to the candidate's Department Chair no later than the end of the first week of classes of the fall term in which the case is to be reviewed.

The record of evidence shall remain available to the candidate's Department Chair and relevant members of the faculty for their appraisal in accordance with the Code of Professional Responsibility. All appropriate administrators and faculty members reviewing the case shall confine their deliberations and decisions to the School's Uniform Policy and Procedure (Section C) and Criteria Guidelines (Section D) contained in this Handbook, the department's specific criteria and the official record of evidence.

### C. Uniform Policy and Procedure

The purpose of this section is to set forth a promotion and tenure policy to govern such personnel decisions within the School of Business and Management Sciences. This suggested policy should insure standards and procedures for the evaluation of candidates for promotion and tenure which are consistent with: (1) the professional needs of the School of Business and Management Sciences at IPFW, (2) the requirements of the Indiana University and Purdue University Faculty Handbooks, (3) the legal requirements under which the University must function, and (4) the personal career considerations of individual faculty members.

#### 1. Record of Evidence to Be Considered.

Each faculty member holding academic rank shall be required to submit an annual activity report. This report shall document all professional accomplishments in the areas of; (1) research, (2) service, and (3) teaching. This report shall be submitted in the form and on the documents provided by the Office of the Dean. The Department Chairperson shall be required to maintain these activity reports in a confidential file.

#### 2. Promotion and Tenure Policies.

The School shall have a written policy concerning promotion and tenure which shall be consistent with the requirements of the Indiana University Faculty Handbook and the Purdue University Faculty Handbook and appropriate IPFW Faculty Senate Documents. The School Promotion and Tenure policy shall also serve as a guide to SBMS departments which will promulgate departmental policies consistent with the School policies.

#### 3. Departmental Action.

##### a. Tenure

Recommendation or application for promotion or tenure shall be initiated at the Departmental level. Each probationary faculty member has the right to apply for tenure, alone or as part of promotion. Any tenured faculty member shall have the right to recommend the granting of tenure to a probationary faculty member in her or his department. Such applications and/or recommendations shall be made in writing and submitted to the Department Chairperson no later than May 1 of the calendar year in which consideration is sought.

## b. Promotion

Recommendations and applications for promotion shall be submitted by faculty members to the Department Chairperson no later than May 1 of the calendar year in which consideration is sought. Only those faculty members currently at or above the rank to be considered for a candidate may recommend a candidate for promotion, unless that would prevent the candidate from having a person from his/her own department make the recommendation. Additionally, a faculty member may apply for promotion to the next highest academic rank. Such applications and/or recommendations shall be submitted in writing.

## c. Departmental Evaluation

The primary evaluation of a candidate for promotion and/or tenure shall occur at the Departmental level (the Primary Committee). In cases of recommendation(s) and/or application(s) for tenure the Department Chairperson shall convene a meeting of the Department's tenured Faculty who are not members of the School Promotion and Tenure Committee to consider the recommendation(s) and/or application(s). In cases of promotion to ranks less than full professor the Department Chairperson shall convene a meeting of those faculty members in the Department holding the rank of associate professor or above, unless there are none. In that case, representation may include a tenured assistant professor and one or more tenured associate professors from other disciplines chosen jointly by the candidate and the Department Chair. The Department Chairperson shall make available, for inspection prior to the meeting, each candidate's case which will be comprised of the official record of evidence as previously discussed in Section II. B.: Discovery of Evidence for Promotion and Tenure Cases. The Department Chairperson will serve as a resource person of the department P&T Committee, but shall not attend committee meetings unless invited.

Those tenured faculty serving as the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee have a responsibility to examine the candidate's file prior to the evaluation meeting. The purpose of the evaluation meeting is to; (1) have a free and open, but confidential forum for analysis of the candidate's record, (2) permit, if necessary, the committee to invite the candidate to appear before it solely for the purpose of clarification of the interpretation of the record of evidence, and (3) conduct a ballot of the faculty entitled to participate in the evaluation of the candidate for the disposition of the application(s) and/or recommendation(s). The department Promotion and Tenure Committee shall also provide the candidate with the results of the ballot and specific reasons concerning its appraisal of the candidate's record of performance, with a copy to the Department Chair.

## d. Chairperson Evaluation

The Department Chairperson shall forward to the chairperson of the School's Promotion and Tenure Committee results of the department's balloting, the specific criteria utilized by the primary committee in its consideration, and the Chairperson's recommendation concerning the tenure and/or promotion action under consideration. The Department Chairperson shall also provide the School Promotion and Tenure Committee with the

appropriate unedited recommendations of the faculty serving as a supplement to the departmental ballot.

e. Exceptions

1. Promotion cases for department chairpersons, deans, and other faculty members with administrative appointments shall be evaluated by the appropriate department promotion and tenure committee. In the event that the candidate is a Department Chair, the recommendations of the departmental committee will go directly to the school P&T committee. In the event that the candidate is a Dean, the recommendations of the school committee will go directly to the all-campus promotion and tenure committee.

2. Recommendations and/or applications for promotion to the rank of full professor or higher shall be made to the Department Chairperson. The Department Chairperson shall review the candidate's case, including the file of year-end activity reports and consult with all faculty members holding the rank of full professor within the Department, not serving on the School's Promotion and Tenure Committee concerning the candidate's qualifications. The Department Chairperson shall forward to the Chairperson of the School Promotion and Tenure Committee his or her recommendation concerning the candidate's promotion, together with the candidate's file and the unedited written comments of the full professors consulted.

3. In cases of Departments where two or less faculty members are eligible to participate in the evaluation meeting, the candidate and Department Chairperson shall jointly determine qualified faculty member(s) from other School of Business and Management Sciences departments, to provide three faculty members to evaluate the candidate's case.

f. Departmental Timetable

All departmental level activities and recommendations must be completed and forwarded to the school P&T committee by the first working day of October so as to allow one month for school level activities.

#### 4. School Action

##### A. Membership of School P&T Committee

The School's Promotion and Tenure Committee, subject to relevant IPFW policy, shall consist of five members elected from the tenured faculty of the School holding at least the rank of associate professor.

The School's Promotion and Tenure Committee shall have at least one member from the Purdue faculty and at least two members from the Indiana faculty. The faculty of Purdue University shall be entitled to elect a tenured associate or full professor and the faculty of Indiana University shall be entitled to elect two tenured associate or full professors to serve as representatives on the Committee. Members of the School's Promotion and Tenure Committee shall serve two year terms.

A School ballot shall be taken to select the remaining elected members of the Committee from among the tenured faculty holding the rank of associate professor or above. The two faculty members receiving the most votes shall serve on the School's Promotion and Tenure Committee. The initial terms to be served shall be one year and subsequent terms shall be for two years, thereby staggering the terms served by the five members of the Committee.

The Dean shall conduct the elections for the representatives from Indiana and Purdue Universities, as well as the general School election. Faculty members eligible to vote in these elections are those who are tenured or on a tenure track.

Department Chairpersons and the Dean shall not be eligible to serve on the School's Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Dean and Department Chairs will serve as resource persons of the School's P&T Committee, but shall not attend committee meetings unless invited.

##### B. Charge of the School's P&T Committee

The School's Promotion and Tenure Committee is to consider all actions of the departmental evaluation committees. This committee shall review the department's assessment of each candidate's record of professional accomplishment and the disposition of each candidate's case. This review may include: (1) a review of departmental promotion and tenure standards and criteria to assure they are consistent with the requirements of the School's Handbook, (2) the department's analysis of each candidate's case, and pursuant to university policy (3) solicitation of, if necessary, outside assistance in the interpretation of the record of evidence so as to ensure the adequacy and consistency of the departmental reviews. This reviewing authority is to be consistent with the applicable University, School, and Department policies.

Upon completion of the P&T Committee's review, the Committee shall conduct a ballot to accept or reject the recommendations of the department. Within the confidential discussion of the committee, each member's vote shall be openly declared. Such Committee is then to compile and forward to the Dean its written recommendations. Such recommendations shall contain a summary of the review conducted and a tally of the ballot taken. The If the School P&T Committee should reject a departmental recommendation, then it must also



forward a written justification explaining the specific reasons for rejection. Simultaneously, a complete copy of the Committee's recommendation shall be forwarded to the candidate and his/her Department Chair.

#### C. The Dean's Recommendation

The Dean, after review of the school P&T Committee's recommendation, shall forward to the chair of the Campus Committee, her or his recommendation concerning the promotion and/or tenure of all candidates. Simultaneously, the Dean shall forward copies of such recommendation to the candidate, the candidate's Department Chair, and the school P&T committee. In case of a disagreement between the school P&T Committee and the Dean, the Dean shall convene the P&T Committee and explain her or his reasons for a recommendation which is inconsistent with that of the committee. The P&T Committee shall be given an opportunity for additional input prior to the Dean's transmittal of her or his recommendation to the Campus Committee. If the disagreement persists the P&T Committee shall be given the opportunity to review the Dean's recommendation and attach a rebuttal to the Dean's recommendation to be forwarded to the Campus Committee along with the Dean's recommendation.

#### D. School Level Timetable

All school level activities and recommendations must be completed and forwarded to the all-campus level by the deadline imposed by the Campus Committee (currently November 1). Should this due date change substantially, it may necessitate alterations in the candidate's original submission date and/or the departmental due date so as to provide for a month at each of the department and school levels.

#### 5. Campus Level Review

All recommendations of the school for promotion and/or tenure will be reviewed by the Campus Committee of the Fort Wayne Faculty. As specified in appropriate Senate document(s), members of this committee shall be selected by the Chief Executive Officer of IPFW after consultation with the two Speakers of the Faculty from a list of nominees provided by the Faculty of the schools. The School of Business and Management Sciences shall forward the names of five (5) nominees for membership consideration on such committee. These nominees will represent the five departments within the School, and will be elected by their respective departments.

## D. CRITERIA GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

## STATEMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

"EXCELLENCE" in each of the areas of research, teaching and service must be demonstrated through external recognition, and faculty cases for personnel actions must contain documentation of such recognition.

Obviously, research is the most straightforward area of the three to document the peer recognition and acceptance, due to the outside review/referee process that evaluates our scholarly activity. Often the level of such recognition is used to distinguish academic rank when the individual is on a research appointment. Moreover, the rank of assistant Professor is typical when the individual is terminally qualified and has the understanding, perspective, and potential to assemble a program of research. For those with research as their designated area of excellence, the rank of associate professor is used when the individual has such a program of research under way and has achieved a demonstrable amount of recognition from unbiased/detached/external peers. The rank of full professor is reserved for those whose research program has also gained for them a sense of national recognition. This is often documented via the "caliber" of the publication outlet. Naturally, a minimal amount of scholarly research is expected for "competence" and a positive tenure decision.

It would appear that, while admittedly more awkward for teaching and service, there are definite parallels in the demonstration of "EXCELLENCE" in their respective arenas. The following table serves to promote the theme of "External recognition and documentation" for promotion considerations:

## Level

	<u>"competence"</u>	<u>"Excellence" to Assoc</u>	<u>"Excellence" to Full</u>
TEACHING	positive recognition by students and/or departmental peers is <u>expected</u>	positive external recognition from <u>beyond</u> the dept ie) from the School, Ft Wayne campus, &/or I.U. or Purdue system	positive external recognition from <u>beyond</u> the Ft. Wayne campus ie) from the I.U. or Purdue systems &/or the national level
SERVICE	conscientious participation in self-governance & service recognition by an external constituency are <u>expected</u>	external recognition from <u>beyond</u> the dept ie) from the School, Ft Wayne campus, I.U. or Purdue systems, community, &/or profession	external recognition from <u>beyond</u> the Ft. Wayne campus/area ie) from the I.U. or Purdue systems &/or one's profession

## TEACHING EVALUATION GUIDELINES

Teaching is one of the fundamental missions of the School of Business and Management Sciences. The contributions of an individual faculty member to the teaching mission of the School will be evaluated at the departmental level within the general guidelines set forth in this School document. It shall be primarily the responsibility of the individual faculty member to provide the documentation on which such departmental evaluation is based. Such documentation is to be consistent with Items 1 through 5 in section B, Discovery of Evidence For Promotion and Tenure Cases of this Handbook.

Teaching will be evaluated as either:

1. Excellent,
2. Satisfactory, or
3. Deficient.

It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide evidence that his/her teaching warrants a rating above the benchmark of competence. It is the responsibility of the Department Chair and/or Departmental personnel evaluation committee to provide evidence that the teaching performance is less than competent. Competent teaching (ie. acceptable for continued long term employment) is determined to exist in the absence of a preponderance of objective evidence to the contrary.

"Competent teaching" is the minimal level of effective teaching acceptable within the School of Business and Management Sciences. Effective teaching is a multi-dimensional issue. The Indiana University Academic Handbook [1988 edition, pg. 26] identifies the "prime requisites of any effective teacher" to be:

- 1) intellectual competence,
- 2) integrity,
- 3) independence,
- 4) a willingness to consider suggestions and to cooperate in teaching activities,
- 5) a spirit of scholarly inquiry which leads the teacher to develop and strengthen course content in the light of developments in the field as well as to improve methods of presenting material,
- 6) a vital interest in teaching and working with students, and above all
- 7) the ability to stimulate their intellectual interest and enthusiasm

In sum, effective teaching is grounded in an appreciation of scholarship, both for oneself and the students, and an acceptance of the responsibility of contributing positively to the academic growth of those one influences. The above characteristics are presumed to be the positive manifestations of effective teaching, and consequently, are interpreted as teaching "outputs". Admittedly, the assessment of the quality of such "outputs" is a difficult and potentially controversial task. However, the evaluation of teaching quality is so important that faculty must periodically validate their effectiveness in this vital area. Such validation should include the provision of objective evidence in the annual SBMS productivity reports that attests to the merit of the manifestations/"outputs" of the individual's instructional capability and commitment. Note that the failure to periodically validate one's effectiveness in teaching may constitute evidence of deficiency in this critical area.

The primary attributes of any evidence used to substantiate teaching effectiveness are "objectivity" and "external recognition". Sources for such evidence may include, but are not limited to: the collective judgement of students, colleagues, and experts in teaching methods who have attended the faculty member's class(es), active involvement with professional organizations that focus on teaching effectiveness, the use of properly validated cognitive testing instruments, and instructional materials/syllabi which indicate innovation in course content and/or delivery system. Guidelines for documenting each of the above "outputs" are offered below:

#### 1) Intellectual Competence

"Intellectual competence" mandates that the cognitive content of the course reflect current and accurate thinking in the discipline. Indicators of the level of intellectual competence may be gained through third party neutral in-class evaluations by those familiar with the subject material, faculty peer review of course syllabi and peer recognition in the form of publications of either pedagogical or scholarly content. A faculty member's case, put forward on the basis of "Excellence in Teaching", should include each of these three indicators of this component of teaching quality.

#### 2) Integrity

Integrity is a multifaceted issue that must be assumed of each faculty member unless allegations of its absence can be documented. Clearly, tolerance of student dishonesty demonstrates a lack of concern with integrity for the academic process. Lax or arbitrary grading standards, the creation of unwarranted grade expectations, and other behaviors designed to manipulate students to gain favorable instructor/course evaluations may be considered as a lack of integrity.

### 3) Independence

Like integrity, independence also has multiple dimensions. It is expected that the faculty member be able to conduct courses without ongoing supervision from a senior faculty member or administrator, thus demonstrating "administrative" independence. In addition, "intellectual" independence implies that the faculty member is sufficiently familiar with current developments in the subject material to have formed independent opinions, theories, and/or investigations in the area. As was the case with integrity, few measures exist for independence that are direct forms of external recognition aside from third party neutral in-class evaluations, and the annual review performed by one's immediate supervisor. An indirect, external and affirmative reflection of one's intellectual independence could be the acceptance of scholarly work in relevant professional journals.

### 4) A Willingness to Consider Suggestions and to Cooperate in Teaching Activities

This dimension may include the introduction of innovative instructional methods, the use of technology in an environment where it is other than the norm, and team teaching efforts, among other manifestations. The evaluation of this aspect of progressive open-mindedness may involve examining the evolution of a given course syllabus through time. In addition, either student evaluations or peer/department chair evaluations may be able to assess how willing a professor is to assist students, implement innovative instructional methods, and consider positive third party suggestions.

### 5) A Spirit of Scholarly Inquiry Which Leads the Teacher to Develop and Strengthen Course Content in the Light of Developments in the Field as Well as to Improve Methods of Presenting Material

There is considerable overlap between the implications of this dimension and those of 1), 3) and 4) above. This dimension appears to contemplate "maintaining currency" in one's academic area and assuring that such currency is reflected in one's course content and methods. In most scholarly disciplines, such currency is a function of keeping-up with the literature. In some more vocational oriented disciplines, this dimension also needs to reflect current practices "in the field". Journal subscriptions, memberships in professional societies and organizations, attendance at conferences, and published research are all often used to measure "currency" in one's academic area. Admittedly, none of the above assure that the faculty member translates such an exposure into currency of course content and methods. Here, third party-neutral review of syllabi and visitation of classes by those qualified to attest to the timeliness of the course material and instructional methods would be necessary of any personnel cases claiming "Excellence in Teaching".

6) A Vital Interest in Teaching and Working With Students

Documenting such "interest" is similar to the task of proving "intent" in a court of law. This dimension undoubtedly has some interweaving with issues 4) and 5) above. Consequently, some of the same instruments can be used to assess whether the faculty member was, for example, "helpful", "available", and "interested" in students. Once again, carefully validated questionnaires for current students, graduated students, third party observers, peers, and the Department Chair may be appropriate methods of providing data on this dimension. Faculty involvement in non-classroom teaching, such as supervision of independent studies, or participation in university sanctioned student organizations is evidence of such interest.

7) The Ability to Stimulate Their [Students] Intellectual Interest and Enthusiasm

Properly controlled evaluation questionnaires of current students may be the benchmark instrument for data collection regarding this particular component of effective teaching. However, for cases claiming "Excellence in Teaching", an extended assessment of the longer-term impact of the intellectual stimulation is warranted. Such impact should be documented via post-graduation surveys of students. Less direct indicators of this impact dimension include students electing to enroll in additional courses in the faculty member's field, doing independent study in the area, and pursuing graduate work in the discipline. Clearly if such additional academic pursuits of former students are to be attributable, in part, to a particular faculty member's stimulation, testimony to that effect must be included with the case.

Moreover, for the seven dimensions of effective teaching cited by the Indiana University Academic Handbook (June 1988 edition), there are numerous indicators or measurement vehicles possible. The table below attempts to summarize the relevant role of each measurement vehicle discussed above and cite each as being pertinent to the demonstration of competence (C) and/or excellence (E) for purposes of promotion and tenure.

INDICATOR	"OUTPUT" FORM *							RELEVANT FOR:
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Syllabi / handouts / & instructional materials	X			X	X			C, E
Course/instructor evaluations				X		X	X	C, E
Departmental peer evaluations	X			X		X		C, E
Annual review of supervisor			X	X				C, E
Non-classroom teaching Activities						X		C, E
Professional memberships, subscriptions and/or conferences attended					X			C, E
3rd party neutral in-class evaluations eg.) colleagues outside the candidate's department who have achieved the candidate's sought for rank, based upon excellence in their teaching			X	X	X	X		E
Unsolicited student appraisals							X	E
Random surveys of former students						X	X	E
Publications	X		X		X			E

The above list of indicators is not intended to be an exhaustive itemization of legitimate evidence of teaching effectiveness or innovation. The general theme of these indicators is "tangible documentation and external review and recognition". Other, less direct evidence that is typically positively correlated with improvements in teaching effectiveness include, but is not limited to:

continuing education / workshops attended that relate to the course content and/ or delivery system,

individual accreditation by professional associations,

new course development, and

contributions to curriculum

\* see page 12 for "Output Form" numbers

While such indirect evidence is potentially quite valuable to both the faculty member and the department/school, it can only be viewed to complement effective teaching and should not be valued as a substitute for the more direct forms of classroom effectiveness cited earlier.

### EXCELLENT TEACHING

The candidate for promotion in rank based upon "Excellence in Teaching" should assemble documentation from multiple sources indicating that the faculty member has successfully delivered courses that are well organized, progressive, and intellectually stimulating beyond the levels of performance normally associated with effective teaching in the candidate's department at this and comparable institutions. Such evidence should carry a theme of "external recognition" to give it validity. For promotion to the rank of associate professor, such external recognition should come from beyond the candidate's department (ie. from the School, campus, and/or university system). For promotion to the rank of full professor on the basis of Excellence in Teaching, such recognition should come from beyond the Fort Wayne campus (ie. from the parent university system and/or regional or national level).

### DEFICIENT TEACHING

Deficient teaching is determined to exist if the faculty member fails to deliver a well organized course based upon the values of academic scholarship and integrity. Such inability to provide students with the directed learning opportunity normally associated with minimal departmental competence in teaching may arise due to inadequacies in the delivery system, the content itself, and/or the value system conveyed by the instructor. Correctable teaching deficiencies in either delivery system or content should be identified as early as possible so that the faculty member and the Department Chair can work together to assemble a course of action designed to rectify the deficiency within a specified time horizon. Only if such corrective measures fail to transform the deficiency to acceptable performance should the deficient rating be assigned.

Objective evidence for alleging instructional deficiency include consistent negative instructor evaluations by students and colleagues attending such courses and/or the failure to provide periodic evidence to validate the presumption of competence in teaching, as discussed above. In addition, certain behaviors are considered inconsistent with competent teaching. These include, but are not limited to, failure to meet scheduled classes, failure to hold office hours, racial, sexual or religious discrimination, arbitrary and capricious grading policies and practices, and tolerance of dishonesty among students. Clearly a breach of an accepted value system such as discrimination or moral misconduct must be proven via a clear preponderance of evidence before teaching performance is evaluated as deficient.



## SERVICE EVALUATION GUIDELINES

Service to the various University and academic communities is a necessary portion of the mission of the School of Business and Management Sciences at IPFW. The School of Business and Management Sciences recognizes competence and excellence in service as legitimate factors in the evaluation of a candidate for promotion and/or tenure.

Service of academic/professional merit is to be distinguished from good citizenship. For service to be of academic/professional merit, it must demonstrate the application of "educated talent, technical competence, and professional skills" as cited by the Indiana University Academic Handbook (June 1988 edition, pg.26). Such service should reflect favorably on the University and the individual's academic status. Moreover, such involvement should bring credit to the University, the School, and/or the faculty member's department.

Good citizenship is defined under ACADEMIC POLICIES, Sections II and III [pp. 34 and 35] of the Indiana University Academic Handbook. The requirements listed in the Academic Handbook are threshold requirements for good citizenship. These activities are not service, yet their proven absence may be considered as evidence of a lack of regard for the basic service requirements of an individual faculty member. Good citizenship, moreover, cannot be the basis for an 'excellence' rating in service activities.

Service will be evaluated as being:

1. Excellent,
2. Satisfactory, or
3. Deficient.

For service to be evaluated as excellent the candidate for promotion or tenure must show with a preponderance of objective, documentable evidence that the services provided are worthy of such a rating. For service to be evaluated as deficient the Department Chair must provide clear evidence that the services provided deserve this rating. If the Department Chair has evidence of a deficiency in service this evidence must first be brought to the candidate's attention within thirty days of the discovery of the evidence and the candidate counseled on appropriate methods to resolve the deficiency. If deficiencies in service continue after a reasonable administrative attempt to aid in the correction of the alleged deficiency, the candidate need only be given warning that such evidence will be considered in promotion and tenure decisions and the candidate must be given an opportunity to respond to the charge.

The following rules will be applied in the evaluation of service activities:

#### **EXCELLENCE IN SERVICE**

Excellence in service requires substantial applications of educated talent, professional skills, and technical expertise. The candidate must provide clear evidence that the services provided are the application of educated talent, professional skills, and technical expertise and that such applications are clearly recognized by the recipients as coming from a professional associated with IPFW.

Categories of service activities involving the application of educated talent, professional skills, and technical expertise which may be relied upon to demonstrate excellence include:

1. service to the profession [academic],
2. service to outside communities [professional], and
3. administrative service.

"Excellence" is defined to be:

Distinguished service in academic, professional, and/or administrative duties, such that:

1. The talent, skills, and expertise applied are of such a quality that their contributions are recognized by the profession as being clearly superior to those normally expected of a professional in the field.

2. The quantity/quality of the service are of a sustained and improving nature, bringing consistently greater recognition over a period of years.
3. The service output is clearly beyond the routine and normal quantity/quality of service expected of a professional in the field.

A single category or a combination of the three categories may be relied upon to demonstrate excellence. If a single category is relied upon, the service provided in that category must be of such significance as to warrant substantially greater recognition than normally required for the proposed personnel action.

### Service to the Profession

Service to the profession is normally expected of senior faculty members. Normally this service is not compensated and is closely related to the faculty member's activities as a teacher or researcher. Excellence can be demonstrated in this category by the accumulation of evidence that the quantity and quality of the services provided are superior to the majority of academic professionals in the field. Outside, impartial evaluation by experts in the candidate's discipline will be expected to document excellence. At least three impartial persons outside of the IPFW community must assess the record of achievement in service and provide an evaluation of the merit of this service.

Activities which can be documented and evaluated, include but are not limited to:

1. service as a referee, editor, or advisor to a major journal,
2. officer of a professional organization,
3. major responsibilities in the organizing of a national or regional professional conference,
4. service on a governing board of a professional organization,
5. receipt of awards and/or honors for outstanding achievement in the profession or for service to the profession,
6. continuing professional advising or efforts on a major, active committee of a professional organization, and
7. active participation in a study or report of significance undertaken with the sponsorship of a professional organization.

There must be clear evidence that the candidate's contributions to these service activities were meritorious and involved the application of educated talent, professional skills, or technical competence. Other activities of a similar nature will also be given credit, but only if the required external recognition is present.

Service to Outside Communities

Service to outside communities is divided into two distinct categories, (1) non-pecuniary, and (2) pecuniary. The evaluation and weighting of these categories must differ, since pecuniary activities are not focused exclusively on a faculty member's association with IPFW. Although each of these categories will be subject to the same evaluation standards, the quantity/quality of pecuniary activities necessary to establish excellence should be substantially more than for non-pecuniary activities. Pecuniary activities alone, cannot justify excellence in service. However, excellence in pecuniary activities, together with a substantial record of achievement in any other category of service shall establish service excellence.

## Non-Pecuniary Activities

To the extent that educated talent, professional skills, and technical competence are applied and are demonstrated to be excellent by objective evidence and impartial, outside review, then service to outside communities constitutes a viable path to the advancement of academic rank. The following are illustrative of the types of activities to be evaluated under this category:

1. not-for-pay consulting for government agencies, private enterprises or non-profit organizations [a number of such organizations are necessary to show general acceptability]
2. substantial participation in a study or report for an outside organization,
3. service on significant committees, advisory boards, or boards of directors of non-profit organizations requiring professional skills, etc.,
4. officer of a government or non-profit organization, and
5. frequent citation in, or interviews with, media, national publications or broadcasts. National recognition would be weighted by a multiple of at least three over state-wide, and state-wide by a multiple of two over local.

## Pecuniary Activities

Paid consulting which requires the application of educated talent, professional skills, and technical expertise can also be used to establish excellence. Excellence in this category requires that the activities occur for several clients over a broad geographic range, such that a national reputation for excellence is in evidence. A preponderance of credible evidence and wide acceptability is necessary to establish excellence in this category.

## Administrative

Excellence can be established through substantial administrative service. The administrative services offered in this category must require the application of educated talent, professional skill, and technical expertise. There must be substantial objective evidence of quantity/quality of service being superior to that routinely expected of administrators. Evidence that must be provided as a prerequisite to consideration of excellence is:

1. evaluations of administrators who work closely with and/or are the supervisors of the candidate,
2. comprehensive evaluations of all faculty members who serve under the administrator and where applicable student evaluations of the effectiveness of the candidate's administrative services, and outside clients' appraisals of same, and
3. impartial, outside evaluation of the administrator's record of achievement.

An administrator being evaluated under this category must have demonstrated an effectiveness beyond the routine with documented objective evidence. The record of evidence must clearly demonstrate substantial growth and increased efficiency over a period of years for excellence to be found in administration. Administrative services alone are not normally a basis for excellence in service. A substantial record of achievement in at least one other category of service must also be in evidence.

## **SATISFACTORY SERVICE**

Satisfactory service is defined as the absence of excellence or deficiency. Good citizenship is a prerequisite to a satisfactory service performance rating. Moreover, satisfactory performance requires that each faculty member will serve on committees, accept a reasonable burden of administrative duties, and work cooperatively with student organizations and administrative officers of the University in order to further all the legitimate goals of the institution. In addition to such routine contributions in the area of institutional service, a minimal contribution must be in evidence to at least one of:

service to the academic profession,  
service to outside professional communities, and  
administrative service

in order to establish a satisfactory service performance.

## DEFICIENT SERVICE

Several types of professional conduct are inconsistent with the service obligations of a faculty member. These are:

1. dishonesty in performance of service,
2. refusal to participate in self-governance activities, and
3. violation of either the Code of Academic Ethics of the Indiana University Academic Handbook (pp. 32-37) or the Academic Ethics section of the Purdue University Academic Procedure Manual (pp. N31, N32).

Any of these behaviors, if proven with the preponderance of objective evidence, defines deficient service.

In addition, evidence of poor quality service in any category may also form the basis of a finding of deficient service, if supported by a clear preponderance of evidence. Poor quality service may be deemed by the faculty member's Department Chair to be "correctable". Such correctable deficiencies should be identified as early as possible so that the faculty member and the Department head can work together to assemble a course of action designed to rectify the deficiency within a specified time horizon. Only if such corrective measures fail to transform the deficiency to acceptable performance should the deficient rating be assigned.

## TENURE ACTIONS

For tenure, satisfactory performance in service is required.

## PROMOTION ACTIONS

An individual seeking promotion on the basis of excellence in teaching or research need only show satisfactory service as defined above. If an individual is seeking promotion on the basis of excellence in service, the level of service required to establish "excellence in service" is higher for promotion from associate professor to full professor than it is for promotion from assistant to associate professor.

### Promotion to Associate Professor

Promotion to associate professor can be achieved on the basis of substantial evidence that the candidate provided service in one category (except as already noted) that results in significant external recognition for the candidate and IPFW. Significant external recognition is defined to be acknowledgment of excellence from several independent sources from outside the candidate's Department.

### Promotion to Full Professor

Promotion to full professor requires that the candidate establish at least a regional reputation for excellence in more than one area of service. Several independent sources must acknowledge the excellence of the services of the candidate. At least a majority of these sources must be from the academic profession, the practicing professional community, or from beyond the IPFW campus. Local sources of acknowledgment from within the IPFW community are not typically appropriate for establishing excellence at this level.

## RESEARCH EVALUATION GUIDELINES

## INTRODUCTION

The Faculty Handbooks for Indiana and Purdue Universities as well as the current policies of the School of Business and Management Sciences [SBMS] expect publications in media of quality or original contributions of a creative nature. SBMS has the obligation to extend the frontiers of knowledge as well as to make contributions to the community that will enhance the academic reputation and visibility of the School and the University. Faculty members are, however, free to determine in what manner contributions to their respective fields may best be accomplished, subject only to the constraints that their efforts result in original contributions. The categorization of journals and other scholarly activities is necessary to provide a common denominator for evaluation purposes. Specific listings of journals and activities shall be developed by each of the five SBMS departments subject to the quality categories outlined elsewhere in this policy.

## JOURNAL RANKINGS

The departments may consider, as appropriate, the following criteria in evaluating journals and creative endeavors; (1) acceptance rates, (2) where the journals are indexed, (3) rankings of journals by other academic institutions, (4) frequency of citations of articles from the journal in other refereed research and leading textbooks, and (5) other such factors as the Department may deem appropriate in determining the quality of the specific journal or creative endeavor. The review process is the foundation of the quality control applied to research and creative endeavor. An editorial review process may be a substitute for refereeing in assuring the quality of the research in a given publication. The following guidelines for categories should be recognized by each Department in preparing lists of journals and creative endeavors:

CLASS A PUBLICATIONS

This shall be a listing of the top refereed journals of national significance in which the leading research is published. The characteristics of these journals are a high frequency of citation in the path-breaking literature and major textbooks, relatively low acceptance rates, and general recognition across all academic institutions as being among the top 10 to 15 percent of the journals in the fields represented within SBMS.

A Class A creative endeavor shall be defined as a creation of such significance as to be internationally or nationally exhibited by a prestigious institution or organization external to the University whose sole purpose is the furtherance of the arts. In addition the work must be recognized as a genuine contribution to the discipline.



## CLASS B PUBLICATIONS

This category is comprised of refereed journals which are nationally recognized in which significant contributions to the field are published.

Characteristics of these journals include acceptance rates generally in excess of those journals listed in Class A, some citations in leading textbooks and significant articles, and general recognition as being among the upper half of refereed journals in the fields represented within SBMS.

A Class B creative endeavor is defined to be a nationally exhibited creation, recognized as being a substantial contribution to the fine arts.

## CLASS C PUBLICATIONS

This category includes other significant journals. Characteristics of these journals involve a formal process of quality control for articles accepted, an acceptance rate demonstrating some selectivity in acceptance of an article, and general recognition of the journal as having academic merit. A Class C creative endeavor shall be one exhibited on a regional level and recognized as being of significant merit.

## CLASS D PUBLICATIONS

This category includes all other journals, the refereed proceedings of prestigious professional conferences, and other publications, such as monographs, cases, or other such publications that are subjected to a refereeing process and have academic merit. Presentations that qualify for credit under the teaching or service categories may be given credit under those categories, but if such credit is given none shall be awarded in the research category. A Class D creative endeavor is exhibited on a State-wide level and recognized as being of merit.

## CLASS E PUBLICATIONS

All other paper presentations before professional associations that do not result in a refereed proceedings are classified as Class E. Also included in this category are competitive research grant proposals to external agencies such as the National Science Foundation and U.S. Commerce Department. All other meritorious creative endeavors exhibited to the public are classified as Class E.

## MULTI-DISCIPLINARY PUBLICATIONS

Publications appearing in outlets of disciplines related to the fields within the School and inter-disciplinary outlets are to receive the same consideration as articles appearing in outlets traditionally associated with SBMS.

## POINTS ASSIGNED TO PUBLICATIONS

The majority of journals within each classification should be assigned the points appearing in the following table. Recognizing that there may be qualitative differences among journals within the same category, the department may choose to assign plus or minus one point to any given journal relative to the specified points assigned to that journal's classification. Overlap of points between categories is prevented by restricting the assignment of plus or minus one point for a specific journal to Class A and Class B publications. Class C journals may have plus or minus 1/2 point assigned as long as the majority of such journals remain valued as below.

CLASS A . . . . .	12 points
CLASS B . . . . .	6 points
CLASS C . . . . .	3 points
CLASS D . . . . .	2 points
CLASS E . . . . .	1 point

Single authored pieces in class C or higher shall receive a premium of one additional point. Research notes shall receive two thirds (2/3) of what an article in that journal would normally receive. Comments, replies, and book reviews shall receive one third (1/3) of the points of an article.

## BOOKS

Major scholarly books shall be assigned points consistent with their scholarly merit. Scholarly books are defined as those which report the results of original research, (empirical, theoretical, or institutional) which advances the knowledge within the discipline. Normally, a scholarly book will be assigned Class A points [12] if the book is published by a major publishing house. Fewer points will be assigned to books published by minor publishing houses or university presses. The scholarly contribution is to be the primary consideration and additional points may be assigned for exceptionally meritorious work [no more than 20 total points per work].

Textbooks, instructors' manuals, study guides, and other similar work are not generally awarded research credit above CLASS E, unless they make some significant contribution to the field of knowledge. Such works will be assigned points consistent with the level of scholarship and recognition they would have received had their contributory content been published as an article. There is to be no double counting of the same effort, moreover, work done in this category may be counted as a contribution to teaching, but if credit is given for teaching, none shall be given for research. If credit for the project is sought for research, the results of the project are to be externally evaluated by at least two qualified authorities in the field. The project shall then be assigned points for its scholarly merit.

## OTHER RESEARCH

Research done as community service or as proprietary consulting shall receive research points consistent with the academic merit of the project, except that such project shall not be entitled to more than 3 points. No more than 6 research points earned in this category while an assistant professor may be used for promotion to associate professor or tenure, and no more than 7 points earned while an associate professor may be used for promotion to full professor.

There is to be no double counting of the same effort, moreover, work done in this category may be counted as service, but if credit is given for service, none shall be given for research. If credit for the project is sought for research, the results of the project are to be externally evaluated by at least two qualified authorities in the field. The project shall then be assigned points for its scholarly merit.

Credit for the initial project under this category does not preclude credit for related work published in journals or presented at professional conferences.

## ADMINISTRATIVE APPOINTMENTS

For faculty members whose appointments are .5 or more administrative, their research expectation is to be reduced by one point per year of administrative service. The maximum reduction of research expectations is six (6) points.

## ADJUSTMENTS IN POINTS ASSIGNED

Within particular journals and activities there will be qualitative differences in the research contributions. Differences among articles in the same category of journals is also possible. If an article or other research contribution is determined to be of greater significance subsequent to its original evaluation, up to an additional five (5) points may be assigned the work in a subsequent evaluation year. To qualify for additional quality/quantity points there must be a clear preponderance of evidence that the article has been substantially recognized by the profession as a significant original contribution to warrant additional points. The burden of such proof is incumbent upon the person seeking the additional points.

The categories and points assigned to articles in the respective categories are guidelines. If indicated, higher or lower points may be assigned. Review of such assignments shall be by the School's Faculty Affairs Committee. The ad hoc committee on criteria will review the initial designation of specific journals to specific categories to assure compliance with this policy and the reasonableness of the categorization of journals. Additions to or changes in the listings of journals must be approved by the School's Faculty Affairs Committee.

The same journal may be classified differently by the faculties of two or more departments within the School. There should be consistency in the majority of such rankings between departments. However, where consistent with the criteria delineated above, a one category difference in classifications between departments may exist.

## RESEARCH QUANTITATIVE STANDARDS FOR PERSONNEL ACTIONS

SATISFACTORY RESEARCH performance is defined as:

1. From Assistant to Associate Professor -- at least 16 research points must be earned. At least half of the points must be earned through the publication of articles and/or published books.
2. The standard for promotion to Associate Professor also applies to tenure decisions.
3. From Associate to Full Professor -- at least 18 research points earned as an associate professor. Promotion to full professor requires at least one single authored publication in a C or higher category since the beginning of one's career.

EXCELLENCE in RESEARCH is:

4. From Assistant to Associate Professor - 26 points and at least two articles in class B or one in class A.
5. From Associate to Full Professor - 28 points earned as an associate professor or 54 points earned over one's career. Since the beginning of the candidate's career, there must be at least three pieces in a Class B or higher publication, and a minimum of one of these in Class A; there must also be one or more single authored Class C or higher publication.

DEFICIENT RESEARCH is:

Deficient research is determined to exist for an untenured faculty member if such faculty member is failing to make reasonable progress towards the demonstration of competence in research as outlined in 1 and 2 above. Tenured faculty may also demonstrate deficient research if their research productivity is found to be at a quantity/quality level inconsistent with their teaching load reduction from the twelve (12) hour per semester benchmark of the employment contract. In either case, such deficient research output may be deemed by the faculty member's Department Chair to be "correctable". Such correctable deficiencies should be identified as early as possible so that the faculty member and the Department Chair can work together to assemble a course of action designed to rectify the deficiency within a specified time horizon. Obviously, such identification and prompt action are acutely critical for untenured faculty to assure annual contract renewal in advance of the penultimate year for a tenure decision.