

**UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS
ANNUAL REVIEW AND PROMOTION**

**STANDARDS FOR
NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY
04.30.2021**

Purpose

The overriding purpose of this document is to provide non-tenure-track faculty with clarity and structure about the standards for annual review and promotion. It is the responsibility of the faculty to demonstrate the value of their contributions, not the Dean nor the Lecturer Promotion Committee. The non-tenure-track faculty of the Textile Fashion Merchandising and Design (TMD) Department are evaluated separately for annual review and promotion purposes.

It is understood that this document is dynamic and will evolve as the environment in which the College of Business (College) operates and the mission of the College changes. It should be emphasized that this document provides guidance for faculty that is both specific and general. Although some target expectations for performance are provided, it should be understood that there is flexibility in how faculty demonstrate their readiness for promotion. As an example, a faculty member who has fallen short of a quantitative expectation may compensate by a demonstration of high quality of another artifact in that same performance dimension (teaching or service).

This document was created with input from the faculty, Area Coordinator team, and Dean's office. This document should be reviewed periodically by a committee of the Area Coordinators, with input from the general faculty, P&T Committee, and Dean. Revisions can be made with approval from the faculty and Dean. This document goes into effect for the 2021-2022 academic year.

Article XXV in the URI/AAUP Collective Bargaining Agreement shall supersede any guidance provided in this document.

Annual Review and Promotion Standards

In all performance dimensions, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to compile a portfolio of accomplishments that builds the strongest possible support for annual reviews, promotion and/or tenure and bring any unique expectations stated in the appointment letter to the attention of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. It should be understood that the burden of proof that a faculty member is ready for promotion and/or tenure rests with the candidate. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to ensure the material in the Interfolio system is updated, and to assemble a dossier of performance outcomes that is persuasive to all parties involved in the evaluation process. Although critical for all performance dimensions, documentation of supportive evidence is particularly important in the teaching and service components. At all ranks, it is important that faculty make visible efforts to show progress over the entire period of review to be successful in obtaining tenure and/or promotion.

Annual Review

The purpose of the Annual Review is to provide feedback on how each faculty member is performing their professional duties in the areas of teaching for Lecturers and both teaching and service for Senior Lecturers and Teaching Professors. The information accumulated in the Annual Review provides the basis for decisions about retention in rank, promotion, non-renewal, or termination. Lecturers and Senior

Lecturers are required to be reviewed annually. Teaching Professors are required to be reviewed every 2 years. As per the URI-AAUP collective bargaining agreement, the completed dossier will be submitted to the Provost after review within the college. The purpose of this review is for the Dean to provide their evaluation to the faculty member of progress toward promotion.

Once the contract of a non-tenure-track faculty has successfully been renewed, if a faculty member is not meeting expectations, a meeting with the Area Coordinator and Dean will be scheduled to work out a performance plan.

Promotional Standards

Promotion to Senior Lecturer

For promotion to Senior Lecturer after four consecutive years as a Lecturer, a faculty member must exceed expectations in teaching (i.e., obtain a rating of “Exceeds Expectations” or “Significantly Exceeds Expectations”). Lecturers are also expected to engage in professional career advising of students. Therefore, faculty must earn 8 or more points over the promotional period to be considered for promotion (see “Outcome Expectations: Teaching” below for teaching activities that earn points).

	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations	Signif. Exceeds Expectations
Teaching Points earned over the past 4 years	3 and below	4-5	6-7	8-9	10 and above

Promotion to Teaching Professor

For promotion to Teaching Professor after at least eight consecutive years teaching, having a terminal degree, and after successful promotion to Senior Lecturer, a faculty member must either significantly exceed expectations in teaching and meet expectations in service OR exceed expectations in both teaching and service over the promotional period. Therefore, at minimum, a faculty must either:

1. Obtain a rating of “Significantly Exceeds Expectations” in teaching (i.e., earn 10 points or more) and “Meets Expectations” in service (i.e., earn 8 points or more) over the promotional period, OR
2. Obtain a rating of “Exceeds Expectations” in teaching (i.e., earn 8 points or more) and “Exceeds Expectations” in service (i.e., earn 10 points or more) over the promotional period.
3. Senior Lecturers who obtain less than the average of 2 points per year during the period of review with emphasis on the more recent years for promotion will not meet the service expectations for promotion to Teaching Professor.

Teaching	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations	Signif. Exceeds Expectations
Points earned over the promotional period	3 and below	4-5	6-7	8-9	10 and above

Service	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations	Signif. Exceeds Expectations
Points earned over the promotional period	4 and below	5-7	8-9	10-11	12 and above

Outcome Expectations: Teaching

The following table (Table 1) indicates ways in which a non-tenure track faculty member should demonstrate satisfactory teaching. A minimum of six points over a promotional period and a minimum of 1.5 points per year, is required for a rating of “Meets Expectations.” Meeting Expectations is required to continue appointment but is not sufficient for promotion.

Table 1: Teaching Activities

Activity	Points Per Year*
Demonstration that all courses are set up following the generic syllabi, course description, and/or area faculty developed course objectives, including using the Learning Management System to communicate the syllabus and objectives	.25 per year; Maximum of 1 point per promotional period
Outcome Assessment: Evidence of the use of some form of individual evaluation to assess student learning that maps to program level expectations and outcomes	1
Evidence of feedback on projects, exams, and assignments (beyond providing a grade) that is designed to increase and enhance learning	1

Evidence of analysis and corresponding innovation or continued excellence in teaching methods, approaches, and techniques	1
Showing students accomplish learning outcomes, especially in courses that offer 150+ credit hours	1
Course Development/Improvement: Evidence of the use of continuous evaluation and improvement process, which can be demonstrated with the following artifacts: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Evidence that formative feedback on IDEAs is used to inform changes that improve learning outcomes 2. Letters of evaluation from student, alumni and colleagues 3. Evidence that students continually meet course learning objectives 	1
Faculty Development: Evidence of the dissemination of new teaching techniques	1
Faculty Development: Evidence of mentoring other faculty/doctoral students with respect to teaching	1
Faculty Development: Participating in Advancement of Teaching and Learning (ATL) programs (e.g., HIT Seminar, online pedagogy, etc.) or any other significant faculty development program taken outside of URI	0.5
Creation of teaching/instructional materials: Textbooks	1 point for 1st edition; 0.5 points for revised editions
Creation of teaching/instructional materials: Web Texts/Teaching Material, Online and Blended Courses, Case Studies and Exercises	0.5
Other indicators that may be suggested with approval by a simple majority of the Area Faculty, with support of the Area Coordinator and approval of the Dean	0.25 - 1

***Unless otherwise specified**

Outcome Expectations: Service and Citizenship

Faculty in the College of Business are expected to engage in academic citizenship activities within the College and extramural engagement outside the College. Faculty can meet service expectations through a combination of service activities within the College and external to the College as outlined Table 2 below. Some activities are more strategically critical than others for the College and the University and are given different weights in the table. If there is any significant compensation for these services, they are not included in the service count. Faculty are responsible for documentation of service activities.

To earn a satisfactory rating in service and citizenship (i.e., a rating of “Meets Expectations”), Senior Lecturers are expected to earn a minimum of 2 points per year and a minimum of eight points over a promotional period in service. Meeting Expectations is required to continue appointment but is not necessarily sufficient for promotion. Lecturers are expected to advise but are not required to participate in service nor will they be reviewed nor evaluated on service. Other activities may be suggested by faculty for consideration and possible approval during a meeting of the Area Coordinators. The decision will be submitted to the Dean or Dean’s Designee for possible final approval.

Table 2: Service and Citizenship Activities

Activity	Points
Union Executive Committee	1
Board member of a non-profit or for-profit organization (documented significant responsibilities; count per organization)	1
Leadership role in industry or professional workshops or seminars (relevant to area teaching)	1
President of a major academic organization	1
Significant administrative responsibility (e.g., Coordinator, Director)	1
Faculty Advisor of a student organization or major event	1
AACSB Peer Reviews or Peer Mentoring	1
Mentor Honors Project or Undergraduate Independent Research Project	1
International Study Abroad or Faculty Exchange, e.g. J-term Travel Course	1
Chair Committee at the University level	1
Chair COB committee	1
Invited talk or panel presentation (academic setting, industry, or professional organization)	1
Civic or professional leadership (boards, officials, etc. w/significant responsibilities; duties related to academic discipline)	1
Creating and/or delivering an education seminar for a business, non-profit or discipline-based professional association	1
Media publication or interview in a relevant business topic (at the national or international level)	1
Trade-oriented publication on relevant disciplinary topic	1
Technical report or white paper on relevant disciplinary topic for an organization	1
Liaison with advisory board	1
Engage in a significant service activity associated with the initiatives in the COB strategic plan	1
Participate in annual reviews and promotion for all non-tenure-track faculty in COB	1
Attendance at a substantive academic seminar/workshop in teaching discipline area	0.5
Active member of university committee	0.5
Active member of COB committee	0.5
Textbook reviewing	0.5
Active involvement in curriculum and/or assessment (e.g., program-level evaluation)	0.5
Obtain grant to support pedagogical and/or research activities that don't net income to the college but don't create unfunded expenses for the college	0.5
Participation in various student development activities (e.g., career outreach/placement, Career Day, Beta Gamma Sigma, Open Houses, Graduation, etc.)	0.5 total
Regularly conduct observations for peer evaluations of teaching and for RPT	0.5
Community service directly related to discipline	0.5
Engage with industry partners and alumni in clubs or classroom setting (e.g., guest speakers, guest lecturers, event speakers) (maximum of 1 point per review period)	0.5 each

Engagement in advancement/fund-raising activities	0.5
Serve as reviewer of peer-reviewed articles or engage in textbook surveys/focus groups	0.5
Immersive student experience (e.g., taking students to NY financial district)	0.5
Serve on a doctoral or thesis committee within or outside URI	0.5

APPENDIX A

PROMOTION AND PROCESS

1. Review Package (dossier)

- A. The promotion package of each faculty requesting consideration for promotion will comply with the format required by the Provost (currently Interfolio) and the faculty member will submit their dossier using the timetable set by the University for submission to the COB Lecturer Promotion Committee (for everyone outside of TMD faculty).
- B. In addition to the required information, each faculty member is encouraged to submit a self- rating on Teaching and Service (if applicable) and the rationale for this rating in the form of a summary page listing supporting evidence.

2. Peer Review

- A. Reviewing Group-
 - 1. The peer review group for each faculty member will be his or her area and can include an evaluation by Senior Lecturers, Teaching Professors, and any tenure track faculty member in the College.
 - 2. Each faculty member can also request an evaluation by any other area groups.
- B. Information obtained from peer reviews
 - 1. The Lecturer Promotion Committee (or an appointed sub-committee) will develop a form to rate faculty performance consistent with the promotion standards as stated in the policy document, in consultation with the dean.
 - 2. These forms will ask peers for information helpful in judging such things as the quality and impact of teaching, the extent to which courses are consistent with generic syllabi, and the quality of service.

3. Committee Recommendation-

The promotion committee will provide the Dean with its recommendation for promotion along with its score on Teaching and Service (when applicable). The committee will also provide the Dean with its justification and rationale for each score.

- A. Each member of the Lecturer Promotion Committee will review dossiers of each faculty seeking promotion. Based on (1) material presented by the candidate, (2) peer review information, and (3) professional judgment, each member will evaluate and score each candidate on Teaching for Lecturers seeking promotion to Senior Lecturer and Teaching and Service for Senior Lecturers seeking promotion to Teaching Professor.
- B. The Lecturer Promotion Committee will convene as a group to derive a committee score.
 - 1. If all members are in agreement, the agreed upon recommendation will prevail.
 - 2. If there is disagreement, committee members will discuss the candidate in an attempt to arrive at a consensus score.
 - 3. A vote of the majority of the whole committee shall prevail.

4. Communication of Committee Recommendation

- A. Before the committee submits its recommendation to the Dean, it will communicate this recommendation to the faculty member.
- B. If the faculty member disagrees with the committee's score and/or recommendation, he or she can request a meeting with the committee or its chair to discuss the evaluation.
- C. The committee will decide whether an amendment is warranted. Once the committee makes this decision, it will forward the recommendation to the Dean.

5. Annual Review

Peer reviews will be conducted for annual reviews using the process outlined in #2 above before the Dean prepares a written review for the faculty.

Note: Article XXV in the URI/AAUP Collective Bargaining Agreement shall supersede any guidance provided in this document.