

School Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure Recommendations School of Business Administration

INTRODUCTION

The vision of the School of Business Administration (School) is "...to be a nationally renowned urban school of business administration." With its strategic location in the major metropolitan and business center of Oregon, the School is dedicated to becoming the leading academic and professional resource for business education in the Northwest. This includes providing students with educational opportunities that are unsurpassed in terms of excellence and being a responsive partner with the business community to advance Oregon's overall economic health. Central to achieving these objectives is a tenure-track faculty with the scholarly capabilities to create, communicate and apply cutting-edge business-related knowledge to the problems confronting businesses today and in the future. Promotion and tenure guidelines facilitate these objectives by articulating the evaluation criteria believed to be associated with faculty long-term performances and contributions to their chosen discipline(s), and to the missions of Portland State University and the School of Business Administration.

Effective September 1996, Portland State University (University) revised its promotion and tenure criteria. Essentially, there are three major changes. The first is a reconfiguration of evaluation criteria that places a greater emphasis on the quality and significance of scholarship in the evaluation of faculty for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and Professor. Second, modifications in the review process (See Appendix A) are proposed, in part, due to changes in University guidelines and, in part, due to the School's own recent history with the promotion and tenure review process. The goal is a fair and comprehensive evaluation process conducted within the practical limits of time, resources and human judgment. Third, a new aspect of the process is the inclusion of the scholarly agenda to encourage scholarly development throughout the faculty member's career (See Appendix B).

The purpose of this document is to set minimum standards for promotion and tenure of tenure-track faculty within the School of Business Administration and to provide guidance to School promotion and tenure committees in conducting their assessments of eligible faculty. The new University and School promotion and tenure guidelines are in effect for all new tenure-track faculty hired after September 1, 1996 and for all faculty promoted to Associate Professors after September 1, 1996. All other tenure-track faculty have the option of being assessed with either the previous guidelines or with these revised guidelines. Fall 2001 is the last year that faculty can go up for promotion and tenure under the previous Portland State University Policies and Procedures For the Evaluation of Faculty Members for Tenure, Promotion and Merit Increases dated October 1990 (*reformatted September 1991*).

CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

I. Associate Professor

In the usual course of events, promotion to Associate Professor and granting of indefinite tenure should be considered concurrently in the sixth year in rank as an Assistant Professor. However, in cases of extraordinary accomplishment, this may occur in fewer than six years. Consideration for promotion to Associate Professor without tenure can occur as early as the third year in rank as an Assistant Professor.

A. Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor requires the individual to have made contributions to knowledge as a result of the person's scholarship, whether demonstrated through the scholarship of research, teaching, or community outreach. In the School of Business Administration, these contributions to knowledge typically involve publications in refereed outlets, regarded highly in one's chosen discipline(s). Publications in lower-level refereed journals or non-refereed outlets may still represent a scholarly contribution to knowledge, but will require closer scrutiny by multiple and credible sources. Criteria for evaluating the quality and significance of scholarly accomplishments, regardless of publication outlet, are detailed in Section II.D of the University's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, and include the following:

- Clarity and Relevance of Goals. Basic questions of inquiry are clearly stated and address substantive aspects of one's chosen discipline or interdisciplinary field.
- Mastery of Existing Knowledge. A scholar is well-prepared and knowledgeable about developments in one's field. Scholars propose methodologies, measures and interventions that reflect relevant theory, conceptualizations, and cumulative wisdom.
- Appropriate Use of Methodology and Resources. A scholar addresses questions of inquiry with carefully constructed logic and methodology. Rigorous research and applied problem solving requires well-constructed methodology that allows one to determine the efficacy of the tested hypotheses or chosen intervention.
- Effectiveness of Communication. Scholars possess effective oral and written communication skills that enables them (1) to make formal oral presentations and to write effective manuscripts that meet the professional standards of one's chosen discipline, and (2) to convert knowledge into language that a public audience can understand. Scholars subject their ideas to critical inquiry and independent review (e.g., journal articles, books, and presentations at professional conferences).
- Significance of Results. Scholars evaluate whether or not they achieve their goal and whether or not this achievement has an important impact on and is used by others. Peers, who are subject matter experts, and other multiple and credible sources (e.g., end-users of the scholarship) evaluate the significance of the results. Scholars disseminate their work into the public domain to invite scrutiny and to measure varying degrees of critical acclaim.
- Consistently Ethical Behavior. Scholars conduct their work with honesty, integrity, and objectivity. They foster a respectful relationship with students, community participants, peers, and others who participate in or benefit from their work. Faculty standards for academic integrity represent a code of ethical behavior.

It is the discretion of the candidate for promotion and tenure to document in their portfolio evidence of recent and ongoing scholarship that will be evaluated along the previously stated six criteria. Evidence of scholarship may be documented from any combination of research,

teaching or community outreach activities, in accordance with section II.E of the University's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. Consideration should also be given to whether the candidate's contributions to knowledge reflect continuous engagement, and whether these contributions demonstrate future promise.

The case for scholarship based on research activities includes an assessment of the quality and significance of the candidate's publication record. The evaluation should consider whether the publications are refereed, an important form of peer review, along with evidence of citation or use of the candidate's research by other scholars. Additional consideration should be given to grant proposal submissions, software development and publication, honors and awards, serving on editorial boards, and providing scholarly leadership as an officer of a major professional organization (e.g., program chair).

The case for scholarship based on teaching activities includes an assessment of the quality and significance of the candidate's curricular innovations and teaching methods that are published in pedagogical journals or presented at educationally-focused professional meetings. Teaching scholars disseminate promising innovations to appropriate audiences and subject their work to critical review. The evaluation should consider peer review of the pedagogical contribution, adoption by other teachers, and the impact the contribution has on improving student learning. Additional consideration should be given to contributions to larger curricular goals that impact entire programs or majors, and to thesis / dissertation advising.

The case for scholarship based on community outreach activities includes an assessment of the quality and significance of the application of the candidate's discipline expertise on defining and resolving problems or issues confronting a firm, industry or economic sector that are published in journals, or are presented at professional meetings. Community outreach scholars disseminate promising applications to appropriate audiences and subject their work to critical review. The evaluation should consider peer review of the community outreach application, and the impact the contribution has on firm, industry or sector success. Additional consideration should be given to contributions to public policy or influence on professional practice, and to international as well as local, regional or national arenas.

B. Effectiveness in teaching, research, or community outreach must meet an acceptable standard when it is part of a faculty member's explicit contractual responsibilities, in accordance with section II.E of the University's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. For example, despite a strong scholarship record in research or community outreach work, a candidate who is judged to be an ineffective teacher shall be denied promotion, when that is part of the faculty member's responsibilities. Or, despite a strong scholarship record in research and demonstrated teaching effectiveness, a candidate who is judged to be ineffective in contractual work with the business community shall be denied promotion, when that is part of the faculty member's responsibilities. Or, despite a record of demonstrated teaching effectiveness and effective contractual work with the business community, a candidate who is judged to be ineffective in conducting research shall be denied promotion, when that is part of the faculty member's responsibilities. Typically, all tenure-track faculty in the School have teaching and research responsibilities. In some cases, faculty may also have explicit community outreach responsibilities beyond simply relating well with the business community.

Assessment of teaching effectiveness should include analysis of student course evaluations for at least the most recent two years, course syllabi and other materials developed for use in courses, and contributions to course and curriculum development. Teaching effectiveness, because of differences in teaching methods and techniques, is difficult to assess. Student course evaluations are an important component of measuring teaching effectiveness, but should not be the sole basis for determining effectiveness.

Assessment of research effectiveness should include analysis of the candidate's publication record, and whether the record of published, presented and submitted work suggests active ongoing engagement in research activities and effectiveness in research design, conduct, and dissemination of research findings. There should also be a focus to the candidate's research activities around one or more clearly established research tracts.

Community outreach effectiveness will be assessed against the performance goals agreed to in the explicit contractual arrangement reached between the School / University and the candidate, on behalf of the targeted community group (e.g., firm, professional association, industry association). Analysis of effectiveness should include assessments by appropriate School / University administrators, community members intended to benefit directly from the community outreach activities, and a self-assessment by the candidate.

C. Finally, promotion to the rank of Associate Professor requires the faculty member to have performed his or her fair share of governance and professionally-related service activities of the University. Typically, these activities include (1) committee service at the department, School, or University level, (2) activities that enrich University life, such as attending commencement or serving as advisor to student groups, and (3) professional service within one's chosen discipline that does not engage an individual's scholarship, such as serving as treasurer or program coordinator for a conference. A candidate who has a strong scholarship record and is evaluated as effective in carrying out teaching, research, and community outreach responsibilities may still be denied promotion if the candidate has not performed his or her fair share of governance and/or professionally-related service activities of the School / University.

II. Consideration for Indefinite Tenure.

Tenure should be granted to faculty members whose scholarly accomplishments are of such quality and significance, and demonstrate such potential for long-term performance, that the University, as far as its fiscal and human resources permit, can justifiably undertake to employ them for the rest of their academic careers. The granting of tenure should be even more significant than promotion in academic rank, and is exercised only after careful consideration of a faculty member's scholarly qualifications and capacity for effective continued performance over a career. The granting of tenure reflects and recognizes a candidate's potential long-range value to the institution, as evidenced by professional performance and growth. In addition, tenure insures the academic freedom that is essential to an atmosphere conducive to the free search for truth and the attainment of excellence in the University.

III. Professor

A faculty member will normally not be considered for promotion to Professor until the fourth year in rank as an Associate Professor. Exceptions will be made only in extraordinary cases. Length of time in rank is not a sufficient reason for promotion.

Promotion to the rank of Professor requires the individual to have made significant contributions to knowledge as a result of the person's scholarship, whether demonstrated through the scholarship of research, teaching, or community outreach. The candidate's scholarly portfolio should document a record of distinguished accomplishments using the six criteria for quality and significance of scholarship in Section II.D of the University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.

Effectiveness in teaching, research, or community outreach must meet an acceptable standard when it is part of a faculty member's responsibilities, in accordance with section II.E of the University's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. Finally, promotion to the rank of professor requires the faculty member to have provided leadership or significant contributions to the governance and professionally-related service activities of the School / University.

APPENDIX A

PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW PROCEDURES

1. Authority and Responsibility. The School of Business Administration (School) has established its general guidelines, including the criteria to be used for recommendations for promotion and tenure, which guidelines fulfill the minimum standards of the University guidelines, which have priority. The criteria to be used for promotion and tenure are consistent with University policy and were formulated to allow maximum time for making decisions. The Dean has approved the guidelines and the review procedures set forth hereafter and has forwarded them to the Office of Academic Affairs for its approval.
2. Faculty Council Notification of Eligibles. The Dean shall notify the Chair of the Faculty Council of the names of all tenured and untenured faculty members required to be evaluated. Faculty members required to be evaluated are:
 - a. those ineligible for promotion to Associate or Professor or for tenure;
 - b. those eligible for promotion to Associate or Professor or for tenure;
 - c. tenured faculty subject to the University post tenure review policies.

Faculty members on sabbatical or other approved leaves of absence shall be given the same opportunity for promotion in rank as those on campus.

3. Notification of Faculty and Appropriate Evaluation Procedure. The Faculty Council Chair shall notify faculty eligible for promotion to Associate or Professor or for tenure to identify those who wish to be deferred.
 - a. The evaluation procedure set forth in 4 below shall be followed for:
 - i. faculty ineligible for promotion to Associate or Professor or for tenure,
 - ii. faculty eligible for promotion to Associate or Professor or for tenure who request such evaluation be deferred, and
 - iii. tenured faculty subject to the University post tenure review policies.
 - b. The evaluation procedures set forth in 5 shall be followed for:
 - i. faculty eligible for promotion to Associate and Professor or for tenure who have not requested deferral;
 - ii. faculty required to be evaluated for the grant of tenure;
 - iii. faculty who are eligible for promotion to Associate or Professor or for tenure whose request for deferral received a negative recommendation under the procedure in 4 below.

4. Annual, Deferral & Post Tenure (ADPT) Evaluations.

- a. ADPT Committee Selection. The Chair of the Faculty Council shall poll all tenured professors and associate professors to ascertain the names of those willing to serve on the ADPT evaluation committee. Those willing to serve will have their names placed on a ballot for vote by all tenured and tenure-track faculty. Voters will cast their ballot for one person within each of the five general academic disciplines of accounting, finance, marketing, management, and ISQA. Those chosen shall serve a term of three years. The five-member committee will:
- i. review all faculty ineligible for promotion to Associate or Professor or for tenure;
 - ii. review all faculty eligible for promotion to Associate or Professor or for tenure who request deferral of the evaluation for such promotion or grant of tenure. A request for deferral shall not be accepted without consideration and discussion; and,
 - iii. review faculty subject to the University post tenure review policies.
- b. ADPT Committee responsibilities. The committee shall gather such information as it considers necessary to conduct the appropriate evaluation of the faculty member. Such information may be gathered from other faculty members, the Dean and Associate Deans, members of the community, peers and anyone else the committee deems appropriate. The committee shall prepare a written report with respect to each evaluation, and must indicate that a discussion took place. For untenured faculty the report should evaluate the progress of the faculty member in meeting the standards for the award of indefinite tenure. Recommendations for deferral of faculty who have so requested must be accompanied by a written report. If the committee recommends that a deferral not be granted then an evaluation under the procedures in 5 must be performed. For tenured faculty, post tenure review is subject to University guidelines and policies. At a minimum, the post tenure review should include an assessment of whether teaching, research, and community outreach performance (when part of the faculty member's responsibilities) meets acceptable standards within the School.

5. Promotion & Tenure Evaluations.

- a. Committee Selection. The committee shall be formed to investigate and independently review the candidate's performance and submitted portfolio. A committee of three individuals shall be selected for each candidate to be evaluated. All tenured faculty members of superior rank to the candidate are eligible to be members of this committee. Faculty members may request they not be appointed to a committee. Normally, at least two members shall be from the general academic discipline of the candidate. All members must be from the University, although one may be from outside the School of Business.
- i. The candidate shall submit the names of up to three eligible faculty members to the Faculty Council Chair for potential appointment to the committee.

- ii. The Faculty Council Chair shall appoint two eligible faculty members to serve on the committee, at least one from the list of names previously submitted by the candidate.
 - iii. The two appointed committee members and the Faculty Council Chair, after consultation with the candidate, select a third eligible faculty member to be appointed to serve on the committee.
 - iv. The appointed members of the committee shall select the Chair.
- b. Committee Responsibilities. The committee and the candidate shall have the responsibility of gathering the information necessary for the evaluation. External peer reviewers, from multiple and credible sources, shall be required to substantiate the quality and significance of the candidate's scholarship. External peer reviewers typically include subject matter experts within the candidate's chosen discipline(s), and, in the case of scholarship based on teaching pedagogy or community outreach, end-users of the scholarship (e.g., other instructional faculty or business professionals using the candidate's scholarship). Normally excluded from being an external reviewer are close personal relationships, co-authors and mentors of the candidate (e.g., dissertation chair). External peer review must accompany recommendations for tenure and for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor. The committee is also expected to consult with School faculty from the candidate's discipline(s) (e.g., other faculty from the candidate's interest area) to gain their assessments of the candidate's scholarly competencies and accomplishments. For faculty to be reviewed for one of these personnel decisions, a list of potential external reviewers, which when appropriate should include members of the community able to judge the quality and value of research directly impacting the external community, shall be compiled in the following manner.
- i. The committee chair will ask the candidate for a list of external reviewers (at least four) who are qualified to be subject matter experts from outside the University. The candidate may also provide a list of possible reviewers perceived as negative or biased; although inclusion on this list will not preclude a request for evaluation, the candidate's exception will be included as matter or record, if an evaluation is requested.
 - ii. The committee will select at least four additional external reviewers. The chair will send the combined list to the Dean for review. The Dean may add names to the list.
 - iii. The committee will select up to eight but not fewer than four external reviewers from the combined list. A sample letter of solicitation is provided in Appendix II of the University guidelines. (Please note, as suggested in the sample letter, the external reviewer shall be advised that their external review letter is not confidential and will be available for the candidate's review, if requested after completion of the committee's report. Requests for external evaluations shall include a copy of the

University and SBA's criteria for promotion and tenure. The candidate, in consultation with the committee, shall choose which samples of the faculty member's work shall be sent to external reviewers. A complete evaluation file must include at least four letters from external reviewers. In cases when promotion or tenure decisions are deferred, external evaluations may be used in subsequent considerations for a period of three years.

- c. Student Participation. In addition to the course evaluations completed by students each term, the committee shall also solicit letters from students to assess teaching effectiveness.
- i. The committee will ask the candidate for a list of students (at least four). The candidate may also provide a list of possible students perceived as negative or biased; although inclusion of a name on this list will not preclude a request for an evaluation letter. The candidate's exception will be included as a matter of record, if an evaluation letter is requested. As a suggestion to the committee, up to twelve additional student evaluators should be selected by the candidate's committee from past class lists, to obtain a sufficient student response rate.
 - ii. The student evaluator shall be advised that the letter of evaluation is not confidential and will be available for the candidate's review.
 - iii. In conformity with University policy for external peer reviews, in cases when promotion or tenure decisions are deferred, student evaluation letters may be used in subsequent considerations for a period of three years.
 - iv. A complete file of evaluation letters must include at least two letters from student reviewers. At least one letter must be included from the list provided by the candidate and at least one from the list provided by the candidate's committee.
- d. Committee Report. The committee's report shall be in the form of a written narrative. The report must address the following three areas:
- i. contribution to knowledge as a result of the candidate's scholarship (whether demonstrated through scholarship activities related to research, teaching or community outreach),
 - ii. effectiveness in research, teaching, or community outreach when it is part of the candidate's explicit contractual responsibilities, and
 - iii. governance and professionally-related service.

Contribution to knowledge shall be organized around the six criteria for evaluating the quality and significance of scholarly accomplishments with input from external reviewers. A summary statement by the committee shall indicate whether the candidate exceeds, meets, or does not meet the criteria for quality

and significance of scholarly accomplishments. Both the quality and quantity of contributions to knowledge should be considered.

Likewise, the committee shall indicate whether the candidate has been effective in their research, teaching and community outreach responsibilities, and in their governance and professionally-related service activities.

The committee must make one of three decisions and the vote of each voting member of the committee must be recorded on the recommendation form (Appendix III to the University guidelines). The candidate is entitled to a copy of the report.

- i. **Deferral:** A deferral vote related to a tenure decision is normally appropriate for faculty members being reviewed in the first five years of an annual appointment. However, for a faculty member in the sixth year of an annual appointment, the committee must make a positive or a negative recommendation.
 - ii. **Positive Decision:** This decision is appropriate for faculty whose attainments warrant promotion and/or tenure. For faculty members recommended for tenure, the committee's evaluation report should survey all years being counted toward tenure, including years of prior service that have been extended to the faculty member in his or her original letter of offer. For faculty members recommended for promotion, the committee's evaluation should survey the faculty member's years at Portland State. Where a positive recommendation is being made, a written report following the format in Appendix III to the University guidelines must accompany the recommendation form.
 - iii. **Negative Decision:** This decision is appropriate for faculty on annual tenure when in the committee's judgment, termination should be recommended. If in its review of a faculty member on an annual appointment, even within the first five years of such an appointment, the committee does not find that a faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward tenure, the committee may indicate a negative decision. Negative recommendation must be accompanied by a written report following the format in Appendix III to the University guidelines.
- e. **Reconsideration.** Within two weeks of receipt of written notice of the committee's action, the faculty member must make a written request for a reconsideration of the recommendation. The review may be requested on the basis of procedural or substantive issues. The faculty member should prepare whatever supportive material is pertinent and submit it with the request.
6. **Curriculum Vitae.** All faculty members being reviewed must provide to their respective evaluating committee an updated curriculum vitae. Curricular vitae should follow the format provided in Appendix I of the University guidelines.
 7. **Review of the Candidate by the Faculty.**

a. Procedure.

Tenure. All tenured faculty shall be eligible to participate in a meeting to evaluate the adequacy of the committee's report and to vote on a recommendation of grant of indefinite tenure of the candidate. All eligible tenured faculty members are expected to read the committee's report prior to the meeting and to participate in the scheduled meeting. Faculty shall be given a minimum of a two-week notice prior to the meeting, though additional advanced notice is encouraged. If an eligible tenured faculty member has read the committee's report, but is unable to attend the scheduled meeting (e.g., out of town, on sabbatical leave), the faculty member may request permission from the Chair of the Faculty Council to submit their vote in writing prior to the scheduled meeting.

Promotion. All tenured faculty of superior rank to the candidate shall be eligible to participate in a meeting to evaluate the adequacy of the committee's report and to vote on a recommendation of promotion of the candidate.

Tenured faculty members who are eligible to participate and who are also serving as Assistant / Associate Deans shall vote as members of the faculty. The Dean shall attend the meeting primarily as an observer, not as an active participant in the faculty discussion. The Dean does not vote.

A meeting for this purpose shall be scheduled and called by the Chair of the Faculty Council who shall preside. At the meeting, the committee shall first discuss its deliberations and the content of its report. At the conclusion of the discussion the Chair shall call for a vote on the adequacy of the report. The committee members are ineligible to vote on the adequacy of their own report. The vote will be to accept the report or to return the report to the committee for further consideration. A report shall be adequate if a majority of those voting accept it as accurate and complete for the purpose of allowing an informed vote on the granting of indefinite tenure and/or promotion of the candidate. For this purpose only the "report" shall include the candidate's vitae and accompanying file.

If the vote is to return the report to the committee the vote on the recommendation of the candidate shall be deferred until that process is completed. The committee shall be instructed to reconsider its report only once.

If the report is accepted, or after reconsideration of a report, then a discussion of the candidate shall continue with the committee reviewing its deliberations and recommendations. The discussion may include any matter of relevance to the evaluation recommendation, including additional information provided by those present or by the candidate's own written statement in response to the committee's report. During the discussion criteria for evaluation shall be reviewed. At the conclusion of the discussion, the Chair shall call for votes on the candidate's grant of indefinite tenure and on promotion. The vote shall be taken by signed, written ballot. Only those faculty who have reviewed the information in the candidates file are eligible to vote. Faculty will be asked to attest to their review of the candidate's file either on their ballot or on a separate writing. The ballot will provide for three alternative recommendations:

- i. **Deferral:** A deferral vote related to a tenure decision is normally appropriate for faculty members being reviewed in the first five years of an annual appointment. However, for a faculty member in the sixth year of an annual appointment, the faculty must make a positive or a negative recommendation.
 - ii. **Positive Decision:** This decision is appropriate for faculty whose attainments warrant promotion and/or tenure. For faculty members recommended for tenure, the faculty's evaluation should survey all years being counted toward tenure, including years of prior service that have been extended to the faculty member in his or her original letter of offer. For faculty members recommended for promotion, the committee's evaluation should survey the faculty member's years at Portland State. Where a positive recommendation is being made, a written report following the format in Appendix III to the University guidelines must accompany the recommendation form.
 - iii. **Negative Decision:** This decision is appropriate for faculty on annual tenure when in the faculty's judgment, termination should be recommended. If in its review of a faculty member on an annual appointment, even within the first five years of such an appointment, the faculty does not find that a faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward tenure, the faculty may indicate a negative decision.
- b. **Faculty Vote.** Votes on the adequacy of the report, and on promotion and tenure will be tabulated by the Faculty Council Chair, or the Chair's designee, and verified independently by a second faculty member. The Chair of the Faculty Council will report the results orally to those in attendance and in the format of Appendix III to the University guidelines after which all ballots will be destroyed. The Committee Chair will communicate to the candidate the results of the faculty vote. The file will then be forwarded to the Dean.

APPENDIX B

SCHOLARLY AGENDA

I. Purpose of the Scholarly Agenda

The scholarly agenda is intended to serve two purposes: (1) to encourage faculty scholarship and development, and (2) to facilitate communication among faculty and administrators regarding individual and collective faculty scholarly efforts to foster a more supportive environment for individual scholarship and assist in School long-term planning. The University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines require that each tenure-track faculty member have a scholarly agenda that is updated annually, but stipulates that the scholarly agenda is to be used for developmental, not evaluative purposes in the assessment of faculty performance.

An individual may include previously submitted annual scholarly agendas in his or her promotion and tenure documentation, but it is not required. Documentation for promotion and tenure may include a discussion of the scholarly agenda that describes the long-term goals and purposes of a scholarly line of work, explains how the agenda fits into a larger endeavor and field of work, and demonstrates how scholarly accomplishments to date have advanced the agenda. It may also include a description of how the agenda relates to the School's academic mission, within the context of the University mission and the faculty member's chosen discipline(s). However, neither the Dean, nor other faculty, sign-off on submitted annual scholarly agendas; nor does the successful achievement, or failure to achieve, one's own articulated scholarly agendas translate directly into a positive or negative promotion / tenure decision. Rather, in promotion and tenure reviews an individual's contributions to knowledge are evaluated solely in accordance with the criteria for the quality and significance of the scholarship, as detailed in Section II.D of the University's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.

II. Individual Faculty Responsibility

Each faculty member, regardless of rank, has the primary responsibility for planning his or her own career and for articulating his or her own evolving scholarly agenda. The purpose of a scholarly agenda is to provide a means for individuals to articulate their programs of scholarly effort. The scholarly agenda needs to be specific enough to provide a general outline of a faculty member's goals, priorities, and activities, but it is not a detailed recitation of tasks or a set of detailed, prescribed outcomes. A scholarly agenda:

- articulates the set of serious intellectual questions, issues or problems which engage and enrich an individual scholar,
- describes an individual's proposed contributions to knowledge, providing an overview of scholarship, including long-term goals and purposes,
- clarifies the emphasis placed by the individual on research, teaching, community outreach to achieve his or her scholarship, and
- articulates the manner in which the scholar's activities relate to the department or School missions and programmatic goals.

As a faculty member grows and develops, his or her scholarly agenda will evolve to reflect changes in the set of questions, issues, or problems that engage the scholar, or in the individual's relative emphases on teaching, research, and community outreach.

III. Departmental, School and College Responsibilities

The development of a scholarly agenda supports a collaborative process of School planning and decision-making that determines the deployment of faculty talent in support of School and University missions. In pursuit of the School and University missions, faculty may be encouraged to take on diverse scholarly agendas. The School and individual faculty members are expected to engage in joint career development activities throughout each faculty member's career. Such activities:

- recognize the individual's career development needs,
- respect the diversity of individual faculty interest and talents, and
- advance the department or School missions and programmatic goals.

IV. Process

All tenure-track faculty members shall prepare a scholarly agenda, or an update of their last year's scholarly agenda, to be attached to the annual activity report. The annual activity report is not considered complete without an attached scholarly agenda. Unlike the activity report that measures the accomplishments of the past year, the scholarly agenda is forward looking. Simultaneous preparation of these two documents enables faculty to assess how the previous years' activities fit into their scholarly agenda and the extent to which their scholarly agenda may have evolved as a result of the past years' activities. Faculty not on a tenure-track, may choose to use the scholarly agenda as a professional development tool, but are not obligated to do so.

The scholarly agenda should be kept to one or two pages in length. The scholarly agendas will be separated from the submitted annual activity reports and placed in a binder to be forwarded to the Dean for review. It is expected, though not required, that the Dean will provide feedback to individual faculty members. After the Dean's review, the binder of scholarly agendas is made available for all faculty members to review, including use by the Annual, Deferral & Post Tenure (ADPT) committee.

Untenured tenure-track faculty members are required to provide a copy of their annual scholarly agenda to each of the tenured faculty in their interest area. It is the collegial responsibility of each faculty member who receives the untenured faculty member's scholarly agenda to provide feedback on a timely basis. The intent of this feedback is to be developmental and not evaluative. Likewise, tenured faculty are encouraged, but not required, to provide other members of their interest area with copies of their scholarly agendas for collegial review and feedback.

Interest areas (e.g., accounting, finance, ISQA, management, marketing) are expected to meet periodically to discuss scholarly goals of the interest area. This collegial review should focus on how the individual scholarly agendas fit into the needs / plans / goals of the interest area. An executive summary of this review should be forwarded to the Dean to facilitate individual faculty development and future interest area staffing.