

**Procedures for Faculty Management:
Annual Review of Untenured Faculty by Tenured Faculty
The J. Whitney Bunting College of Business**

Untenured, tenure-track faculty members within each department of the College of Business are reviewed annually by tenured faculty in their department. Completion of these annual reviews is an aspect of mentoring carried out by senior faculty members in the College. The criteria for these annual reviews are consistent with the College's Promotion and Tenure Document, the University pre-tenure review process, and the Academic Affairs requirements for annual rating of faculty performance by the department chair.

Objective

Tenured faculty members complete a review of untenured faculty annually to:

- Provide untenured faculty with a clear appraisal each year of their progress toward tenure,
- Assist the department chair in the creation of the annual review for untenured faculty,
- Help develop a singular opinion of untenured faculty progress toward tenure among tenured faculty, and between tenured faculty and the department chair, and
- Inform tenured faculty of the progress untenured faculty within their department are making toward tenure.

Timeframe

Review of untenured faculty by tenured faculty occurs each year until the award of tenure.

- The annual review by tenured faculty occurs after submission of the Individual Faculty Report (IFR) and before completion of the chair's evaluation of faculty performance.
- The University pre-tenure review is informed by but distinct from this annual review during the year of pre-tenure review.
- In most cases the tenured faculty members who perform the annual review will also constitute the departmental promotion and tenure committee.

Procedure

Department chairs and tenured faculty members are strongly encouraged to review the College's Promotion and Tenure Document prior to conducting an annual review of untenured faculty in order to become familiar with evaluation criteria for tenure.

- Untenured faculty members submit an IFR, copies of published research and an updated vita to the department chair. No other materials will be accepted from the candidate. The department chair adds copies of student teaching evaluations and other appropriate departmental teaching evaluations to the portfolio.
- All the tenured faculty members in a department review the portfolio(s) of that department's untenured faculty. The chair may (at his/her discretion) add tenured faculty from a related discipline if there are fewer than three tenured faculty members in the department.
 - Faculty members use the teaching evaluations as one measure of the untenured faculty member's classroom effectiveness.
 - Faculty review the published research to form judgments about the quality of the scholarly activities completed to date by the untenured faculty member.

- Tenured faculty members and the department chair meet as a group to discuss the progress toward tenure of untenured faculty in the department.

Candidate Ratings

- The discussion between tenured faculty and the department chair informs that chair about the progress untenured faculty are making in the areas of teaching, research, professional development, and service. Faculty may also comment on collegiality.
- If there is a lack of consensus among the tenured faculty, or between the chair and the tenured faculty, regarding a candidate's rating in a given area the chair will inform the candidate. (Definitions for each category of faculty performance are listed below.)
- The department chair uses this conversation with tenured faculty, along with items such as the IFR and teaching evaluations, when writing the department chairperson's evaluation of faculty performance. The chair discusses this evaluation with each untenured faculty member.

In accordance with University guidelines, obtaining a favorable rating on an annual review does not bind the University to recommend an untenured faculty member for tenure when the requisite years of service have been achieved.

Definitions of Ratings

The following definitions are used on the "Department Chairperson's Evaluation of Faculty Performance."

Excellent: The rating for faculty whose *performance far exceeds requirements* in principal professional responsibilities on a consistent basis. This rating is normally reserved for those few individuals whose performances are outstanding to all.

Commendable: The rating for faculty whose *performance clearly and consistently exceeds requirements* in principal professional responsibilities.

Fully Acceptable: The rating for faculty whose *performance consistently meets requirements* in principal professional responsibilities. This rating recognizes satisfactory accomplishment and achievement.

Needs Improvement: The rating for faculty whose *performance has approached, but not met, requirements* in principal professional responsibilities. The need for further development is definitely recognizable. This rating in a particular area is considered grounds for rejection of a tenure application.

Unsatisfactory: The rating for faculty whose *performance clearly fails to meet requirements* in principal professional responsibilities. Improved performance is expected and required as a condition of continued employment in the position. A rating of "Unsatisfactory" in a particular area indicates the problems related to faculty member performance are severe enough to constitute grounds for dismissal.

Approved by vote of School of Business Faculty, Friday February 17, 2006
Reviewed by the Department Chairs, Wednesday October 30, 2013

These procedures were developed by the department chairs in the college, in consultation with the Dean and Associate Dean, and modified by the Faculty Development Committee, February 2006.