

Roles, Scope, Criteria, Standards and Procedures

of the

JAKE JARS College of Business & Entrepreneurship
(Name of Department/School/College)

Effective Date: 4/18/2019

APPROVALS

SIGNATURE

DATE

GARY CATON

Department Faculty

Gary L. Caton

Chair, Primary Review Committee

5/8/19

Primary Administrative Reviewer

N/A
Department Head/Director

Intermediate Review Committee

N/A
Chair, Intermediate Review Committee

MARK BANAWI

Intermediate Administrative Reviewer

Mark Banawi

College Dean

College Review Committee

N/A
Chair, College Review Committee

DAVID J. SINGEL

University Retention, Tenure and Promotion

David J. Singel

Chair, University Retention, Tenure and Promotion

Robert L. Mokuwa

Provost

Robert L. Mokuwa

Role and Scope Document

Jake Jobs College of Business & Entrepreneurship

Article I. Role and Scope of Unit

Montana State University, the State's land-grant institution, educates students, creates knowledge and art, and serves communities, by integrating learning, discovery, and engagement.

The faculty, staff, and administrators in the Jake Jobs College of Business & Entrepreneurship (JJCBE) support the fulfillment of the University's teaching, scholarship, and service mission through the JJCBE mission to inspire creativity, innovation, and growth.

Article II. Appointment and Advancement of Research Faculty

Not applicable

Article III. Annual Review Process

The faculty member and Dean meet annually to review the faculty member's performance relative to the faculty member's role statement and responsibilities. Evaluations are expected to recognize the requirements and expectations of the position based upon the faculty member's letter of hire, assigned percentages of effort, annual assignments, annual productivity report, and evaluations of teaching. The following procedures should be used in conducting annual reviews:

- (a) The faculty member records relevant professional activities and provides a description of those activities in the relevant systems and manner as prescribed each year (e.g., Activity Insight).
- (b) The Dean, with input from the Associate Dean, rates the performance of each faculty member using the information provided by the faculty member and other relevant information.
- (c) After reading the review, the faculty member must sign the annual review provided by the Dean, including the review summary document required by the University. The signature of a faculty member does not indicate concurrence with the rating; it signifies that he or she has seen the rating. If the faculty member refuses to sign the summary document, the document will be forwarded with the notation that the faculty member refused to sign it.
- (d) Copies of all annual reviews and the performance ratings of each faculty member will be maintained in the faculty member's file in the College. These files will be kept confidential and maintained as outlined in the Faculty Personnel Files policy.

Article IV. Primary Review Committee and Administrator

Section 4.01 Primary Review Committee-Composition and Appointment

- (a) The JJCBE Promotion & Tenure (RPT) Committee will be composed of five tenured faculty members. Two members are appointed by the Dean of the JJCBE, and three members are elected by the tenured and tenurable faculty. The Dean will appoint members following the election of members.
- (i) Appointed Members
 - a. Each appointed member serves for a term of one year. If an appointed member is unable to complete his/her term, the Dean should appoint a replacement member within 30 days of the position becoming vacant to complete the unexpired portion of the term.
 - b. The Dean will not appoint a faculty member who has already served four consecutive years on the JJCBE RPT Committee to a fifth consecutive year unless doing so is necessary to fill both seats on the Committee reserved for appointed members.
 - c. In appointing members, the Dean will be attentive to the composition of the JJCBE RPT Committee, including option, rank, and diversity of members. Normally, at least one-half of the members will have attained the rank of professor.
 - (ii) Elected Members
 - a. Each elected member serves for one term of three years. Upon completion of a member's three-year term, the member may not be re-elected to the Committee for at least one year.
 - b. The Associate Dean will conduct elections in the spring semester each year to select the new members needed to fill vacancies in the ensuing year. Elected members of the Committee will be elected for staggered three-year terms. Elected candidates will be the candidates receiving the most votes. After an election, the ballots will be available for inspection by any tenured or tenurable faculty member.
 - c. If an elected member is unable to complete his/her three-year term, the Committee will conduct a special election within 30 days of the position becoming vacant to elect a replacement faculty member to complete the unexpired portion of the term.
- (b) Term Limits
- (i) Faculty members normally will not serve for more than four consecutive years on the Committee.
 - (ii) If an appointed member serves for two or more consecutive one-year appointed terms on the Committee, that member will not be eligible for election to the Committee for one year after the expiration of the last of the member's two or more consecutive terms.
 - (iii) The Dean may appoint an individual completing his/her three-year elected term to serve a subsequent one-year term as an appointed member but only with the consent of the member. Upon the completion of such member's one-year appointed term, the member may not be elected to the JJCBE RPT Committee for at least one year.
 - (iv) In the event the existing RPT Committee determines that there are only as many eligible faculty members to stand for election to the Committee as there are seats up

for election, the term limits described above can temporarily be suspended for the duration of the shortage of eligible faculty members.

Section 4.02 Primary Review Administrator

Dean of the JJCBE

Section 4.03 Identification of Responsible Entities

- (a) Establish the Primary Review Committee either by facilitating the election or appointment of the members as described.

Dean of the JJCBE

- (b) Select external reviewers and solicit review letters.

JJCBE RPT Committee

- (c) Select internal peer reviewers and solicit review letters

JJCBE RPT Committee

- (d) Assuring the following materials are included in the dossier:

- (i) Internal and external reviewer letters of solicitation, letters from the reviewers and, in the case of external reviewers, a short bio-sketch of the reviewer should be included in the dossier.

JJCBE RPT Committee

- (ii) Applicable Role and Scope Document.

JJCBE RPT Committee

- (iii) Letter of hire, any Percentages of Effort changes, all annual reviews, and all Evaluation Letters from prior retention, tenure, and promotion reviews at MSU.

JJCBE RPT Committee

- (iv) Candidate's teaching evaluations from the review period. If the evaluations are not in electronic format, the unit will provide evaluation summaries. Upon request by review committees and review administrators, the unit will provide access to the original evaluations to review committees and administrators during the review.

JJCBE RPT Committee

- (e) Maintaining copies of all review committee evaluation letters and external review letters after the review.

Staff

Section 4.04 Next Review Level

University Retention, Promotion and Tenure Committee

- (a) Elected representative and alternate

- a. The Associate Dean will conduct elections in the spring semester when the term of the current committee member is expiring.
- b. Tenured and tenurable faculty will vote on the JJCBE representative to the University Retention, Promotion and Tenure Committee.
- c. Only tenured faculty are eligible to serve on the University Retention, Promotion and Tenure committee. Faculty cannot serve on the University Retention, Promotion, and Tenure committee and the JJCBE Retention Promotion, and Tenure committee at the same time.
- d. The elected candidate will be the candidate receiving the most votes and the alternate will be the candidate receiving the second most votes. If the elected faculty member is unable to serve, the alternate will serve instead. After an election, the ballots will be available for inspection by any tenured or tenurable faculty member.

(b) Term Limits

- a. A faculty member will serve one three-year term on the University Retention, Promotion and Tenure committee (URPTC). That faculty member will not be eligible for election to the URPTC for one year after the expiration of the member's term on URPTC.
- b. If the elected faculty member cannot serve out a full three-year term, the alternate will serve out the remainder of the term. If there are two or more years left in the term, the alternate will not be eligible for election to the URPTC for one year after the expiration of the member's term on URPTC.

Article V. Intermediate Review Committee and Administrator

Section 5.01 Intermediate Review Committee - Composition and Appointment

Not applicable

Section 5.02 Intermediate Review Administrator

Not applicable

Section 5.03 Level of Review following Intermediate Review Administrator

Not applicable

Article VI. Review Materials

Section 6.01 Materials Submitted by Candidate

Materials submitted in the dossier by the candidate must include:

- (a) The cover sheet obtained from the Provost's Office
- (b) A comprehensive curriculum vitae (CV) with scholarship, teaching, service, and integration activities of the candidate
- (c) A personal statement (maximum of 2500 words) that summarizes the candidate's case for retention, promotion, or tenure
- (d) A statement (maximum of 50 words) that identifies the candidate's area of scholarship
- (e) Separate self-evaluations for scholarship, teaching, service, and integration summarizing the evidence demonstrating that the candidate meets the standards for the attainment of retention, tenure, or promotion, as applicable. Each self-evaluation will include a summary of activities, selected products or accomplishments, and evidence of recognition over the relevant review period, as described in Articles VIII-XI.
- (f) Selected articles, publications, creative endeavors, or other evidence from the review period that, in the candidate's judgment, best represents the candidate's scholarship

Dossier materials provided to external reviewers by the Promotion & Tenure Committee will include:

- (a) The relevant MSU and JJCBE promotion and tenure standards and candidate's percentages of effort

- (b) A comprehensive curriculum vitae (CV) with scholarship, teaching, service, and integration activities of the candidate
- (c) The statement (maximum of 50 words) that identifies the candidate's area of scholarship
- (d) Selected articles, publications, creative endeavors, or other evidence from the review period that, in the candidate's judgment, best represents the candidate's scholarship In accordance with University policy, if a candidate for retention, tenure, or promotion is suspected of academic misconduct, the JJCBE RPT Committee will suspend its review and refer the case to the Provost's Office.

Section 6.02 Documentation of Collaborative Scholarly Contributions

In the scholarship section of the dossier, candidates should explain their contribution to any collaborative works (e.g., publications, grants, conference presentations, etc.). A candidate must document each listed collaborator's contributions to the scholarship. For example, scholarly contribution for a study might be documented as: "J. Diaz, K. Li, and S. Johnson designed the studies. Diaz conducted the experiments. Diaz and Johnson analyzed the data. All authors participated equally in writing the manuscript."

Section 6.03 Peer Review Solicitation Procedure

In addition to its own internal review of a candidate's scholarship, the JJCBE RPT Committee will use qualified individuals from outside the JJCBE to evaluate this work in all tenure reviews and reviews for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor. The JJCBE RPT Committee will also use qualified MSU faculty, preferably from inside the JJCBE, to evaluate the candidate's performance on teaching, scholarship, integration, and service.

- (a) MSU policy requires external reviews from at least four (4) respected authorities appropriate to the candidate's area of scholarship to provide an independent and objective evaluation of the candidate's scholarship; at least one half of the external reviewers should be persons other than the reviewers recommended by the candidate.
 - (i) The candidate will submit to the JJCBE RPT Committee three names of potential external reviewers, along with a description of their qualifications and their relationship, if any, to the candidate. These potential external reviewers should normally come from institutions with research expectations similar to those of the JJCBE, although candidates may include one or more potential reviewers from institutions with higher research expectations than the JJCBE.
 - (ii) The JJCBE RPT Committee will develop its own list of potential external reviewers. These reviewers will normally come from institutions with research expectations similar to those of the JJCBE.
 - (iii) The JJCBE RPT Committee will select at least one of the reviewers on the candidate's list and two or three other reviewers for a total of four reviewers. All reviewers must meet the following criteria:
 - a. No more than two reviewers can come from the candidate's list.
 - b. All reviewers should be from different institutions.
 - c. The selection of external reviewers must comply with the MSU Conflict of Interest policy.
 - i. No faculty member may serve on any review committee during the year their Dossier is reviewed.

- ii. No person shall participate in the review of any other faculty member related by blood or marriage or similar personal relationship.
 - iii. No person may participate in the review of any person with whom they have a personal, business, or professional relationship that could be perceived to preclude objective application of professional judgment. A conflict of interest occurs when the evaluating party could realize personal, financial, professional, or other gain or loss as a result of the outcome of the review process, or when the objectivity of the evaluating party could be impaired by virtue of the relationship. Examples of persons who may be excluded by professional relationship include undergraduate and/or graduate mentors, postdoctoral mentors, collaborators who are co-investigators on grants and/or co-authors on a significant portion of scholarly products completed during the review period, colleagues who depend on instrumentation controlled or operated by the candidate, and/or co-inventor of a patent.
 - iv. If a reviewer has a relationship with a candidate under consideration that may result in a conflict of interest, they must declare the nature of the conflict of interest before any deliberation occurs.
 - v. If the candidate, any review committee member, or reviewing administrator believes there is a conflict of interest that could preclude an objective application of professional judgment, the candidate or reviewer will notify the provost within ten (10) days of the date the conflict became apparent either through the publication of committee rosters or the later discovery of the conflict which was not immediately apparent. Upon report of a perceived conflict of interest, the provost will determine if a conflict of interest exists that would preclude the objective application of professional judgment and take necessary measures to address the conflict. Failure of the candidate to raise a timely notification of a potential conflict of interest will preclude the candidate from raising an objection based on conflict of interest in subsequent grievances and appeals.
 - d. All reviewers must be at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor.
 - e. The reviewers must be respected authorities about the type of work being reviewed but not necessarily be leaders in the candidate's research area. For a candidate seeking promotion to Professor, at least one reviewer must be nationally recognized in the candidate's area of expertise.
 - f. Each reviewer will supply a current vita along with his or her external review.
- (iv) The identities of all external reviewers will be kept confidential to the limits allowed by law from the candidate and anyone not directly involved in the review process.
 - (v) Reviewers will not be informed of the JJCBE RPT Committee's evaluation or final recommendation.
 - (vi) Information from the external letters crucial to the committee's evaluation or recommendation must be incorporated in the evaluation letter.
 - (vii) The JJCBE RPT Committee may seek additional letters from external reviewers who meet the criteria in Section 6.03c. The Committee will notify the candidate in a timely manner of its decision to seek additional reviews and will request from the candidate a list of three additional reviewers. If the Committee seeks two or more additional reviews, at least one reviewer should come from the

candidate's initial list of external reviewers or the candidate's list of additional reviewers.

(b) Two internal reviews will also be solicited by the JJCBE RPT Committee. Candidates will be asked to submit the names of three MSU faculty members. It is preferred that these faculty be tenured or tenure-track JJCBE faculty, but the candidate may select any MSU faculty member. The JJCBE RPT Committee will select one faculty member from the candidate's list. A second internal review letter will be provided by the candidate's option coordinator, if possible, or by a tenured JJCBE faculty member selected by the JJCBE RPT Committee. In selecting reviewers other than option coordinators, an effort will be made by the JJCBE RPT Committee to select individuals who would be in a position to have knowledge of the candidate's teaching, scholarship, service, and/or integration. All selected individuals will be asked to comment on the candidate's teaching, scholarship, service, and/or integration based primarily on their personal knowledge of the candidate. Internal reviewers will be provided with electronic copies of the candidate's curriculum vitae, personal statement, and research work. Issues of confidentiality and the candidate's rights to respond will be the same as with external reviews (see Section 6.03a(iv-vi)).

Article VII. Applicable Role and Scope Documents

Section 7.01 Retention Review

Candidates for retention are reviewed under the standards and indicators in the Role and Scope Documents in effect on the first day of employment in a tenurable position.

Section 7.02 Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor Review

Candidates for tenure are reviewed under the standards and indicators in the Role and Scope Documents in effect on the first day of employment in a tenurable position. Candidates may select a more recent, approved Role and Scope Document by notifying the primary review committee.

Section 7.03 Promotion to Professor Review

The faculty member will be reviewed using standards and indicators in the Role and Scope Documents in effect two (2) years prior to the deadline for notification of intent to apply for promotion.

Article VIII. Retention Reviews

Section 8.01 Timing of Retention Review

Faculty are reviewed for retention in the academic year specified in their Letter of Hire, unless extended under the Extending Tenure Review Period policy.

Section 8.02 University Standard

The standards for the retention of probationary faculty members are:

- (a) effectiveness in teaching, scholarship, and service during the review period, and
- (b) integration of no less than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service, and
- (c) satisfactory progress towards meeting the standards for tenure by the candidate's tenure review year.

Section 8.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting

- (a) Teaching: The required indicators for teaching for retention are course materials including syllabi and assignments; results of periodic and systematic student evaluations; summaries of grade distributions. See Section 9.03a.
- (b) Service: Performance indicators and weighting for retention review are consistent with those identified for tenure. See Section 9.03b.
- (c) Integration: Performance indicators and weighting for retention review are consistent with those identified for tenure. See Section 9.03c.
- (d) Scholarship: Performance indicators and weighting for retention review are consistent with those identified for tenure. See Section 9.03d.

Section 8.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

- (a) Teaching: Quantitative and qualitative expectations for retention are consistent with those identified for tenure. See Section 9.04a.
- (b) Service: Quantitative and qualitative expectations for retention are consistent with those identified for tenure. See Section 9.04b.
- (c) Integration: Quantitative and qualitative expectations for retention are consistent with those identified for tenure. See Section 9.04c.
- (d) Scholarship
 - (i) Qualitative considerations: Discipline-based scholarship, pedagogical research, and contributions to practice are all valued. Activities subject to a rigorous review process, typically blind peer reviewed, are essential. Articles submitted to or published in journals that do not follow a rigorous review process will not be considered as indicators of scholarship by the JJCBE RPT Committee. Though non-peer-reviewed research activities are viewed as scholarly activities, retention candidates are encouraged to focus on more heavily weighted forms of scholarship because a record consisting solely of non-peer-reviewed activity will not be sufficient for tenure. Scholarship will be evaluated based on both the influence and impact of individual works and the venues through which they are disseminated. If there is any question about whether certain research is of acceptable quality, the College encourages scholars to discuss potential projects, anticipated work product, and target publication/dissemination outlets with colleagues before investing substantial time and effort in the work. The College values substantive contributions to collaborative and cross-disciplinary work as well as solo-authored work. The JJCBE RPT Committee will refer to the candidate's provided descriptions to evaluate whether the candidate's specific contributions to collaborative work (multi-authored pieces) are substantive enough to earn credit as publications toward tenure. The College recognizes the potential trade off in quality of scholarship over quantity of products. Fewer publications of consistently high quality and/or publications in top journals are better than numerous publications in less rigorous outlets. Ultimately, the Committee will

assess the quality of the candidate's research contribution and make suitable quality/quantity adjustments in light of evidence provided by the candidate and information collected by the Committee. Candidates are responsible for providing evidence regarding the quality of their scholarship.

- (ii) Quantitative considerations: Candidates for retention should have one or more papers nearing publication in a peer-reviewed journal and evidence of a pipeline of research projects at various stages.

Section 8.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators

Candidates for retention will submit a dossier that provides indicators of performance that meet the standards for retention. The standards for the award of retention are effectiveness in scholarship, teaching, and service during the review period, and integration of no less than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service. Materials submitted in the dossier by the candidate must include:

- (a) The cover sheet obtained from the Provost's Office
- (b) A comprehensive CV with scholarship, teaching, service, and integration activities of the candidate

In addition to those materials, this section details the specific materials that should be provided as evidence that the candidate meets those performance standards.

- (a) Evidence of Effectiveness in Teaching: To meet the effectiveness standard, candidates should demonstrate that they structure course(s) thoughtfully to achieve course and College learning goals, challenge students to perform at a high level, and reflect on teaching.

- (i) Required materials are:
 1. A brief narrative (maximum 1000 words) that makes the case for effectiveness in teaching
 2. Sample syllabi that include specific course learning goals and map to the College's learning goals
 3. A table summarizing all student evaluation scores from standardized University course evaluation forms during the review period
 4. A table summarizing grade distributions (mean, median and standard deviation) for each class taught by the candidate during the review period
 5. Complete student comments from standardized University course evaluation forms during the review period

- (ii) Candidates should not include indicators such as thank you notes from students or self-administered surveys.

- (b) Evidence of effectiveness in service: To meet the effectiveness standard for retention, candidates should show a record of service consistent with their status as junior faculty members. As evidence of effectiveness, candidates must provide a bulleted list of service activities with dates and organized by and clearly labeled with the type of service (i.e., College, University, Disciplinary, Professional, and Community) for each activity. See Section 9.03b for example indicators of service.

- (c) Evidence of integration: Candidates should provide a bulleted, dated list of integration activities (see Section 9.03c) and clearly label the type of integration demonstrated through each activity [i.e., (a) teaching and scholarship, (b) scholarship and service, (c) teaching and service, and/or (d) teaching, scholarship, and service]. Candidates may also provide a brief

narrative (maximum of 500 words) providing further explanation/justification of integration activities.

- (d) Evidence of effectiveness in scholarship: To meet the effectiveness standard for retention, candidates should have work nearing publication in a peer-reviewed journal and a pipeline of research projects at various stages. Scholarly products that have been submitted or accepted within the review period will be considered. To provide evidence of effectiveness in scholarship, candidates must provide:
- (i) A statement (maximum of 50 words) that identifies the candidate's area of scholarship
 - (ii) A research statement (maximum of 1000 words) that situates the candidate's research for the review committees. This research statement should explain the candidate's research, focus on its impact in the field of expertise, and be understandable to colleagues who are not in that field.
 - (iii) A numbered table of all articles appearing in peer-reviewed publications during the review period (see Appendix A for a template)
 1. This table must be accompanied by a correspondingly numbered list describing the candidate's specific contribution(s) to each collaborative work listed (up to 50 words for each entry). For example: "J. Diaz, K. Li, and S. Johnson designed the studies. Diaz conducted the experiments. Diaz and Johnson analyzed the data. All authors participated equally in writing the manuscript."
 2. If applicable, this table may be accompanied by a correspondingly numbered list (up to 100 words for each entry) that provides additional support for nontraditional/non-business peer-reviewed publications listed in the table (e.g., alternative impact factors, acceptance rates, inclusion in textbook or course pack at another university, internal or extramural funding, reputation of published conference proceedings, competitive review, etc.).
 - (iv) Evidence (see Appendix A for a template) of multiple activities at various stages in a pipeline of scholarship might include:
 1. A table of conference presentations during the review period: This table must be accompanied by a correspondingly numbered list describing the candidate's specific contribution(s) to each collaborative work listed (up to 50 words for each entry). See section 8.05d(iii)1 for an example of how to document collaboration.
 2. A table of grants awarded during the review period: This table must be accompanied by a correspondingly numbered list describing the candidate's specific contribution(s) to each collaborative work listed (up to 50 words for each entry). See section 8.05d(iii)1 for an example of how to document collaboration.
 3. A table of other research output (see Section 9.03d for other potential indicators): This table must be accompanied by a correspondingly numbered list describing the candidate's specific contribution(s) to each collaborative work listed (up to 50 words for each entry). See section 8.05d(iii)1 for an example of how to document collaboration.
 - (v) Candidates may also include up to five selected scholarly products that best represent their scholarship. These products could include full-text articles, publications, creative endeavors, or other evidence. Per University requirements, candidates must include any scholarly products that have been accepted for publication but not yet published or scholarly products published in a journal not readily available through University

databases. In addition, instructions for accessing nontraditional scholarly products (e.g., documentary films) from the review period must be included.

Section 8.06 Status of Scholarly Products

For the retention review, all scholarship submitted during the review period will be considered as evidence of scholarship and a pipeline.

Article IX. Tenure Review

Section 9.01 Timing of Tenure Review

Faculty are normally reviewed for tenure in the academic year specified in their Letter of Hire, unless extended under the Extending Tenure Review Period policy.

Section 9.02 University Standard

The University standards for the award of tenure are:

- (a) sustained effectiveness in teaching and service during the review period, and
- (b) integration of no less than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service, and
- (c) accomplishment in scholarship

Section 9.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting

Under the definitions in the Faculty Handbook, performance indicators are the categories of products and activities used to evaluate performance of the faculty undergoing review. This section identifies potential forms of evidence (i.e., indicators) that candidates may provide to support their case. Each list is neither exhaustive nor entirely mandatory; candidates may provide some of these forms of evidence and/or additional indicators of their performance. Required indicators are identified in Section 9.05. This section serves as guide for candidates to understand the types of performance indicators that they might use to support their case and the weight (i.e., value) the JJCBE RPT Committee places on various indicators. Some indicators may be given more weight; for example, awards can serve as performance indicators, but a prestigious national award may be given more weight than an award from a university.

- (a) Teaching
 - (i) Indicators for teaching include: course materials including syllabi and assignments; results of formal student evaluation, appropriately documented and explained; summaries of grade distributions; results of optional peer evaluation based on class visitations; supervision of research, theses, and dissertations; teaching awards; evidence of student success through a sequence of courses; advising or mentoring relationships with students; other indicators proposed by the candidate
 - (ii) Indicators that demonstrate actual course practices and tie them concretely to course and College learning goals are most highly valued by the College. The criteria for effective teaching are: structuring course(s) thoughtfully to achieve course and College learning goals, challenging students to perform at a high level, and reflecting on teaching. In addition to the candidate's statement, the Committee will examine course materials, complete formal student evaluations, and grade distributions to evaluate

sustained effectiveness in teaching. Indicators that have the potential for selection bias or are not directly related to the criteria will not be given weight in the process. For example, candidate-selected individual student comments, thank you notes, and self-designed and administered evaluations of teaching will not be considered.

(b) Service

- (i) Indicators for service include: participation in the governance of the University at the College or University levels; contributing to College or University projects and programs; mentoring faculty colleagues; serving in leadership roles in professional organizations; serving as journal editor or referee of scholarly papers or proposals; applying professional expertise in public service activities; other indicators proposed by the candidate
- (ii) All indicators of service are equally weighted and valued by the College.

(c) Integration

- (i) Indicators of integration include:
 1. Integration of scholarship and teaching: inclusion of research/creative products in other instructors' pedagogical tools (e.g., a supplement for a textbook, an article included in another instructor's syllabus); using data gathered or results of teaching methods in a published research paper or poster presentation; using personal research to inform a module, topic or other specific content of courses; presentations of research in other professors' classrooms; presentation of teaching innovations at academic conferences; using student research assistants on personal research projects; supervising student research projects, including presentation of their work at conferences (e.g., MSU Undergraduate Research Celebration; co-authored work at national conference); other indicators proposed by the candidate
 2. Integration of scholarship and service: using knowledge learned or data gathered from service activities in a research paper or conference presentation or poster; using personal research to provide community or University service (for example, using results of research on the differential effects of certain marketing techniques on gender to inform the marketing strategies of a service organization or University committee); use of service learning in a course that will result in research activities; serving as a mentor in the Blackstone/406 Labs incubator; providing editor or reviewer expertise to a journal or conference; other indicators proposed by the candidate
 3. Integration of teaching and service: incorporating knowledge learned from writing questions for or grading professional exams (CPA, CFA, CMA, etc.) in specific areas of course; using teaching innovations or methods or content to inform service commitments, such as presenting class content to a professional organization as part of a training session; using teaching activities to benefit a service such as VITA; using teaching activities to analyze, support, and provide student consulting to businesses and organizations; other indicators proposed by the candidate
 4. Integration of teaching, scholarship, and service: preparing teaching activities that are informed by research activity and used in service such as teaching tax, researching the effects of VITA on tax students, and participating in VITA; providing research supervision for student programs, e.g., the McNair Scholars

program, which has both academic and social objectives; other indicators proposed by the candidate

(ii) All indicators of integration are equally weighted and valued by the College.

(d) Scholarship

(i) Indicators of scholarship include: publications in peer-reviewed journals; projects at various stages (i.e., a research pipeline); book publications; awards of extramural funding; conference proceedings; competitively submitted conference presentations; creation of impactful knowledge that serves local, national or international audiences; projects at various stages (i.e., a research pipeline; required); other indicators proposed by the candidate

(ii) Peer-reviewed journal articles and a research pipeline are required for tenure. However, in keeping with its mission, the JJCBE values many forms of research activity. Research activities consist of contributions to discipline-based scholarship, pedagogical research, and contributions to practice. Discipline-based scholarship adds to the theory or knowledge base in the faculty member's area of expertise and includes basic research and applied scholarship that extends existing knowledge to practice areas. Pedagogical research contributes to the academic community's understanding and application of teaching and learning theories and techniques. Contributions to practice interpret existing knowledge for a practitioner audience. Activities subject to a rigorous review process, typically blind peer reviewed, are essential. Articles published in journals that do not follow a rigorous review process will not be considered as indicators of scholarship by the JJCBE RPT Committee. Nonpeer-reviewed scholarly activities are also viewed as research activities, but a record consisting solely of non-peer-reviewed activity is not sufficient for tenure. Scholarship indicators that have been subjected to rigorous peer review processes are valued most highly by the College.

Section 9.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

The Committee will consider the circumstances particular to each candidate and academic discipline. Ultimately, each activity will be judged by its quality and impact.

(a) Teaching

(i) Qualitative considerations: In the JJCBE, we have established and continue to cultivate a culture of high-quality teaching. Quality teaching is a key component of the mission of the JJCBE. Effective instructors:

1. Structure course(s) thoughtfully to achieve course and College learning goals
2. Challenge students to perform at a high level
3. Reflect on teaching (innovations, refinements, etc.)

These qualitative criteria are intended to provide guidance so that the candidate and reviewers can focus on measures that indicate effective teaching and deemphasize criteria that have the potential for selection bias or are not responsive to the criteria for effective teaching.

(ii) Quantitative considerations: Quantitative indicators can provide insight into the quality of teaching. For example, the number of courses taught at certain levels and grades received by students are required materials; due to varied needs across the College, there are not specific quantitative expectations related to teaching assignments. Consistently teaching the same course might be associated with different outcomes than teaching assignments with variation. The JJCBE recognizes the forms of

bias consistently documented in student evaluations of instruction. Though the results of standardized course evaluations are required materials, the Committee will consider overall trends in those results and reflections/reactions to them in determining future course design rather than imposing a required average rating.

(b) Service

- (i) Qualitative considerations: In keeping with the University's mission as a land grant institution, the College values outreach and public service activities that serve the needs and interests of the JJCBE, University, city, state, nation, and world communities. College faculty could participate in professional organizations, community groups, and College and University committees.
- (ii) Quantitative considerations: Candidates applying for tenure should show a record of service consistent with their status as junior faculty members.

(c) Integration

- (i) Qualitative considerations: Candidates can demonstrate integration through the combination of (a) teaching and scholarship, (b) scholarship and service, (c) teaching and service, and/or (d) teaching, scholarship, and service. All forms of integration are equally valued.
- (ii) Quantitative considerations: Candidates need only provide evidence of one type of integration to meet the requirements.

(d) Scholarship

- (i) Qualitative considerations: Discipline-based scholarship, pedagogical research, and contributions to practice are all valued. Activities subject to a rigorous review process, typically blind peer reviewed, are essential. Articles published in journals that do not follow a rigorous review process will not be considered as indicators of scholarship by the JJCBE RPT Committee. Non-peer-reviewed research activities are viewed as scholarly activities, but a record consisting solely of non-peer-reviewed activity is not sufficient for tenure. Scholarship will be evaluated based on both the influence and impact of individual works and the venues through which they are disseminated. If there is any question about whether certain research is of acceptable quality, the College encourages scholars to discuss potential projects, anticipated work product, and target publication/dissemination outlets with colleagues before investing substantial time and effort in the work. The College values substantive contributions to collaborative and cross-disciplinary work as well as solo-authored work. The JJCBE RPT Committee will refer to the candidate's provided descriptions to evaluate whether the candidate's specific contributions to collaborative work (multi-authored pieces) are substantive enough to earn credit as publications toward tenure. The College recognizes the potential trade off in quality of scholarship over quantity of products. Fewer publications of consistently high quality and/or publications in top journals are better than numerous publications in less rigorous outlets. Ultimately, the Committee will assess the quality of the candidate's research contribution and make suitable quality/quantity adjustments in light of evidence provided by the candidate, external reviewers, and information collected by the Committee. Candidates are responsible for providing evidence regarding the quality and impact of their scholarship.
- (ii) Quantitative Considerations: Quantitative indicators can provide insight into the quality of scholarship. Candidates are required to submit ratings (see Section 9.05) from a number of reputable organizations to help with evaluation of journal quality. A record of scholarship without quantitative indicators of quality is unacceptable for

tenure. Normally, candidates for tenure should have a minimum of three peer-reviewed journal publications with at least one in a high quality journal (based on the required indicators of journal quality). In exceptional cases, a publication in an indisputably top journal in the candidate's field may be weighed more heavily. Additionally, because not every exceptionally good article is published in a high quality journal, in unusual circumstances a candidate may meet the high quality publication requirement by showing that a journal publication is generally recognized by others in the candidate's area of expertise as being of superior quality and having an impact on scholarship in the candidate's area of expertise. The candidate has the burden of proving that at least one publication meets these requirements. In addition to a publication record, candidates must have a pipeline of research projects at various stages. Tenure is granted to candidates who demonstrate the potential for continued scholarly contributions.

Section 9.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators

Candidates for tenure will submit a dossier that provides indicators of performance that meet the standards for tenure. The standards for the award of tenure are sustained effectiveness in teaching and service during the review period; integration of no less than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service; and accomplishment in scholarship. As noted in Section 6.01, materials submitted in the dossier by the candidate must include:

- (a) The cover sheet obtained from the Provost's Office
- (b) A comprehensive CV with teaching, scholarship, service, and integration activities of the candidate
- (c) A personal statement (maximum of 2500 words) that summarizes the candidate's case for tenure
- (d) Separate self-evaluations for teaching, scholarship, service, and integration that summarize the evidence demonstrating that the candidate meets the standards for tenure. These self-evaluations should make the case that candidate meets the standards for sustained effectiveness in teaching and service, integration of activities, and accomplishment in scholarship.

This section details the specific materials that should be provided as evidence that the candidate meets those performance standards. (a) Evidence of Sustained Effectiveness in Teaching

- (i) To meet the sustained effectiveness standard, candidates should demonstrate that they consistently structure course(s) thoughtfully to achieve course and College learning goals, challenge students to perform at a high level, and reflect on teaching. The case for effective teaching will be made through a narrative of no more than 1000 words that indicates how those three criteria are met. The candidate is directed to demonstrate sustained effectiveness as an instructor by providing evidence from sufficiently representative data sources to support the arguments for sustained effectiveness. Sustained effectiveness will require both breadth and depth of evidence (i.e., multiple indicators) regarding teaching. The narrative must explain how the syllabus and course assignments map to student learning goals and reflecting on multiple indicators (see Section 9.03a) from across the evaluation period. Candidates might also choose to reflect on their number of preps, course levels, required vs. elective courses, and student composition of course (e.g., option, College, University).

- (ii) In addition to the narrative, candidates must provide support that may be referenced in the narrative. Required materials include:
 1. Sample syllabi that include specific course learning goals and map to the College's learning goals
 2. A table summarizing all student evaluation scores from standardized University student evaluation forms during the formal review period
 3. A table summarizing grade distributions (mean, median and standard deviation) for each class taught by the candidate during the review period
 4. Complete student comments from standardized University student evaluation forms
 - (iii) Optional support materials might include:
 1. Evidence of participation in conventions, conferences, and workshops involving pedagogy
 2. Development of interdisciplinary courses, team-teaching with others inside and outside the discipline, creating new courses, revising current courses, or developing new programmatic areas
 3. Recognition and awards for outstanding instruction
 4. Documentation of effective student mentoring, including academic advising, professional advising, advising student organizations, serving on graduate committees, and assisting graduate students with instruction
 5. See Section 9.03a for additional optional indicators of teaching.
 - (iv) Candidates should not include indicators such as thank you notes from students or self-administered surveys.
- (b) Evidence of sustained effectiveness in service: To meet the sustained effectiveness standard for tenure, candidates should show a record of service consistent with their status as junior faculty members. As evidence of sustained effectiveness, candidates should provide a bulleted list of service activities with dates and organized by and clearly labeled with the type of service (i.e., College, University, Disciplinary, Professional, and Community) for each activity. See Section 9.03b for example indicators of service.
- (c) Evidence of integration: Candidates should provide a bulleted list of integration activities (see Section 9.03c) with dates and clearly label the type of integration demonstrated through each activity [i.e., (a) teaching and scholarship, (b) scholarship and service, (c) teaching and service, and/or (d) teaching, scholarship, and service] and a brief narrative (maximum of 500 words) providing further explanation/justification of integration activities
- (d) Evidence of accomplishment in scholarship: To meet the accomplishment standard, candidates should normally have a minimum of three peer-reviewed journal publications (with at least one in a high quality journal) and a pipeline of research projects at various stages. Per University policy, only scholarly products that have been published or accepted for publication within the review period will be considered as publications and counted toward the tenure requirement. In cases of tenure and promotion, works or products that have been submitted but not accepted at that the start of the review process may not be considered as publications; such manuscripts will be considered as part of a candidate's research pipeline. As evidence of accomplishment in scholarship, candidates must provide:
- (i) A statement (maximum of 50 words) that identifies the candidate's area of scholarship

- (ii) A research statement (maximum of 1,000 words) that situates the candidate's research for the review committees. This research statement should explain the candidate's research, focus on its impact in the field of expertise, and be understandable to colleagues who are not in that field.
- (iii) A numbered table of all articles appearing in peer-reviewed publications during the review period (see Appendix A for a template)
 - 1. This table must be accompanied by a correspondingly numbered list describing the candidate's specific contribution(s) to each collaborative work listed (up to 50 words for each entry). For example: "J. Diaz, K. Li, and S. Johnson designed the studies. Diaz conducted the experiments. Diaz and Johnson analyzed the data. All authors participated equally in writing the manuscript."
 - 2. If applicable, this table may be accompanied by a correspondingly numbered list (up to 100 words for each entry) that provides additional support for nontraditional/non-business peer-reviewed publications listed in the table (e.g., alternative impact factors, acceptance rates, inclusion in textbook or course pack at another university, internal or extramural funding, reputation of published conference proceedings, competitive review, etc.).
- (iv) Evidence (see Appendix A for a template) of multiple activities at various stages in a pipeline of scholarship might include:
 - 1. A table of conference presentations during the review period: This table must be accompanied by a correspondingly numbered list describing the candidate's specific contribution(s) to each collaborative work listed (up to 50 words for each entry). See section 9.05d(iii)1 for an example of how to document collaboration.
 - 2. A table of grants awarded during the review period: This table must be accompanied by a correspondingly numbered list describing the candidate's specific contribution(s) to each collaborative work listed (up to 50 words for each entry). See section 9.05d(iii)1 for an example of how to document collaboration.
 - 3. A table of other research output (see Section 9.03d for other potential indicators): This table must be accompanied by a correspondingly numbered list describing the candidate's specific contribution(s) to each collaborative work listed (up to 50 words for each entry). See section 9.05d(iii)1 for an example of how to document collaboration.
- (v) Candidates may also include up to five selected scholarly products that best represent their scholarship. These products could include full-text articles, publications, creative endeavors, or other evidence. Per University requirements, candidates must include any scholarly products that have been accepted for publication but not yet published or scholarly products published in a journal not readily available through University databases. In addition, instructions for accessing nontraditional scholarly products (e.g., documentary films) from the review period must be included.

Article X. Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor

Section 10.01 University Standards

The University standards for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are the standards for the award of tenure. Appointment at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor does not demonstrate, in and of itself, that standards for tenure have been met.

Article XI. Promotion to Rank of Professor

Section 11.01 Timing of Review

Normally, faculty are reviewed for promotion after the completion of five (5) years of service in the current rank, however, faculty may seek promotion earlier if they can establish that they “meet the same standards of effectiveness and accomplishment or excellence used in evaluating candidates after five (5) years in rank.”

Section 11.02 University Standard

The University standards for promotion to the rank of Professor are:

- (a) sustained effectiveness in teaching and service during the review period, and
- (b) sustained integration of no less than two of the following areas during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service, and
- (c) excellence in scholarship.

Section 11.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting

- (a) Teaching: Performance indicators and weighting for promotion are consistent with those identified for tenure. See Section 9.03a.
- (b) Service: Performance indicators and weighting for promotion are consistent with those identified for tenure. See Section 9.03b.
- (c) Integration: Performance indicators and weighting for promotion are consistent with those identified for tenure. See Section 9.03c.
- (d) Scholarship: Performance indicators and weighting for promotion are consistent with those identified for tenure. See Section 9.03d.

Section 11.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

- (a) Teaching: Quantitative and qualitative expectations for promotion are consistent with those identified for tenure. See Section 9.04a.
- (b) Service
 - (i) Qualitative considerations: In keeping with the University’s mission as a land grant institution, the College values outreach and public service activities that serve the needs and interests of the JJCBE, University, city, state, nation, and world communities. College faculty could participate in professional organizations, community groups, and College and University committees.
 - (ii) Quantitative considerations: Candidates applying for promotion should show a record of service consistent with their status as tenured faculty members. The expectation is that tenured faculty members will participate in more and higher-level option, College, University, and academy service activities than junior faculty members.
- (c) Integration
 - (i) Qualitative considerations: Candidates can demonstrate integration through the combination of (a) teaching and scholarship, (b) scholarship and service, (c) teaching and service, and/or (d) teaching, scholarship, and service. All forms of integration are equally valued.

- (ii) Quantitative considerations: Candidates need only provide evidence of one type of integration to meet the requirements, but it is expected that tenured faculty members will be able to demonstrate integration throughout the review period.

(d) Scholarship

- (i) Qualitative considerations: Discipline-based scholarship, pedagogical research, and contributions to practice are all valued. Activities subject to a rigorous review process, typically blind peer reviewed, are essential. Articles published in journals that do not follow a rigorous review process will not be considered as indicators of scholarship by the JJCBE RPT Committee. Non-peer-reviewed research activities are viewed as scholarly activities, but a record consisting solely of non-peer-reviewed activity is not sufficient for promotion. Scholarship will be evaluated based on both the influence and impact of individual works and the venues through which they are disseminated. If there is any question about whether certain research is of acceptable quality, the College encourages scholars to discuss potential projects, anticipated work product, and target publication/dissemination outlets with colleagues before investing substantial time and effort in the work. The College values substantive contributions to collaborative and cross-disciplinary work as well as solo-authored work. The JJCBE RPT Committee will refer to the candidate's provided descriptions to evaluate whether the candidate's specific contributions to collaborative work (multi-authored pieces) are substantive enough to earn credit as publications toward promotion. The College recognizes the potential trade off in quality of scholarship over quantity of products. Fewer publications of consistently high quality and/or publications in top journals are better than numerous publications in less rigorous outlets. Ultimately, the Committee will assess the quality of the candidate's research contribution and make suitable quality/quantity adjustments in light of evidence provided by the candidate, external and internal reviewers, and information collected by the Committee. Candidates are responsible for providing evidence regarding the quality and impact of their scholarship.

- (ii) Quantitative Considerations: Quantitative indicators can provide insight into the quality of scholarship. Candidates are required to submit ratings (see Section 9.05) from a number of reputable organizations to help with evaluation of journal quality. A record of scholarship without quantitative indicators of quality is unacceptable for promotion. Normally, candidates for promotion should have:

1. At least one high quality publication on average every two years since tenure review, and
2. At least three publications in high quality peer-reviewed journals, and
3. Have made noticeable contribution to her/his area of expertise, which may be measured by frequency of publication, the frequency with which the candidate's work is cited by others, reputation within the field as reported by reviewers, service as an editor of a journal in the candidate's field, the extent to which the candidate serves as a mentor to others in her/his field, and/or other relevant and appropriate evidence provided by the candidate.

The candidate has the burden of proving that her/his work meets these requirements. In exceptional cases, a publication in an indisputably top journal in the candidate's field may be weighed more heavily. In addition to a publication record, candidates must have a pipeline of research projects at various stages.

Section 11.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators

The evidence required to support the case for promotion matches the evidence required for tenure. See Section 9.05 for details about required dossier materials.

Article XII. Procedures for Update and Revision of the Unit Role and Scope Document

Faculty members are entitled to propose changes to Role and Scope Documents of the College. JJCBE RPT Committee members or administrators who identify a need for improvement, clarification, or other revision to an academic unit's Role and Scope Documents may submit the request for changes to the Chair of UPTC. The UPTC Chair will forward the recommendations to the unit. Submission to the UPTC Chair should occur only after the review committee or administrator completes all reviews for the year. The JJCBE will act on any proposed changes received from the UPTC Chair on an annual basis.

Article XIII. Approval Process

Section 13.01 Primary Academic Unit Role and Scope Document

- (a) tenurable faculty and administrator of the primary academic unit;
- (b) promotion and tenure review committee and administrator of all associated intermediate units (usually colleges);
- (c) University Retention Promotion and Tenure Committee (URPTC); and
- (d) Provost.

Section 13.02 Intermediate Academic Unit Role and Scope Document

- (a) promotion and tenure review committee and administrator of the intermediate unit;
- (b) University Retention Promotion and Tenure Committee (URPTC); and
- (c) Provost.

Section 13.03 University Role and Scope Document

- (a) University Retention Promotion and Tenure Committee (URPTC);
- (b) Faculty Senate;
- (c) Deans' Council; and
- (d) Provost.