UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS
ANNUAL REVIEW, PROMOTION AND
TENURE STANDARDS FOR TENURE
TRACK FACULTY
04.30.21

Purpose

The overriding purpose of this document is to provide faculty with clarity and structure about the standards for annual review, promotion, and tenure. Annual reviews will be conducted in accordance with these guidelines so that faculty are able to prepare portfolios that meet the expectations for promotion and/or tenure. The faculty in the Textile Fashion Merchandising and Design (TMD) Department are evaluated separately for Annual Review, Promotion, and Tenure 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 and/or tenure. 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, research, 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, with the option to use the existing guidelines for up to 2 years.

Articles XV-XX in the URI/AAUP Collective Bargaining Agreement shall supersede any guidance provided in this document.

Annual Review, Promotion, and Tenure 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 research, teaching, and service. The information accumulated in the Annual Review provides the basis for decisions about retention in rank, award of tenure, promotion, non-

renewal, or termination.

Note below that faculty will need to exceed expectations in research and teaching in various combinations to be considered for promotion and/or tenure. If a faculty member is not meeting expectations during their Annual Review, a meeting with the Area Coordinator and Dean will be scheduled to work out a performance plan.

Pre-tenure Review for Faculty Completing Third Year

Untenured faculty are required to be reviewed annually. After their third annual review within the college, as per Article 15.11 in the URI-AAUP collective bargaining agreement, dossiers of untenured faculty will be forwarded to the Provost for review (note: faculty with more than one year of credit toward promotion and tenure are not eligible for such evaluation). The purpose of this pre-tenure review is for the Provost to provide their evaluation to the faculty member of progress toward promotion and tenure. The faculty must be showing concrete evidence of progress in meeting the expectations below for promotion and tenure.

Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

For an Assistant Professor to be promoted to Associate Professor and receive tenure, at minimum, a faculty must obtain a rating of "Exceeds Expectations" in research, "Exceeds Expectations" in teaching, and "Meets Expectations" in service. These standards also apply to those faculty hired at the Associate Professor rank who are applying for tenure. As stated above, 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.

Research
The current workload policy places all untenured Assistant Professors on the research profile with a 2/2 teaching load. To meet minimum expectations in research (i.e., obtain a rating of "Meets Expectations"), faculty need to earn at least 9 points in the five years preceding their mandatory tenure decision year, by publishing in refereed ABDC A*, A, B, or C list journal articles, or equivalent scholarship as listed in the Scholarly Output Equivalency Table in Appendix A. Two articles must be designated as A or A* in the ABDC list or Q1 in the SJR List. To continue appointment, faculty must show steady progress in meeting expectations. To earn promotion and tenure, the faculty must exceed these expectations (i.e., earn a rating of either "Exceeds Expectations" by earning 14-18 points or "Significantly Exceeds Expectations" by earning 19 or more points) as described below.

	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations	Signif. Exceeds Expectations
Points earned over the past 5 years	4 and below	5-8	9-13	14-18	19 and above

Faculty who obtain less than 14 research points in the five years preceding their mandatory tenure decision year and do not publish at least two articles designated as A or A* in the ABDC list (or Q1 in the SJR List) will not be recommended for promotion and tenure.

The following assumptions have been made:
a. Journals not on the ABDC list can be classified as accepted in the college, subject to other forms of validation as presented to, and approved by, the Research and Doctoral Committee. The committee will submit their recommendation to the Dean for final approval.
   i.   Acceptance rates
   ii. Published lists

`

iii. Citation analysis appearing in refereed journals
b. Other considerations:
  i. For all faculty, it is important to note that previous methods for evaluating publications will be respected for those articles currently in Revise and Resubmit status, but will be published by December 31, 2021. Untenured faculty who have completed their pre-tenure review can choose to follow either research standard. All new publications should be targeted using the new standards. Therefore, faculty members will be able to make informed decisions about where to target and send their work.
  ii. Relevance to the faculty member's discipline will be taken into consideration when evaluating the portfolio of research.

Teaching

The table in Appendix B indicates ways in which a faculty member should demonstrate satisfactory teaching. A minimum of six points is required for a rating of "Meets Expectations" (approximately 1 point per year). "Meeting expectations" is required to continue appointment. To be recommended for promotion and tenure, Assistant Professors must at least "Exceed Expectations" by earning 8-9 points or "Significantly Exceed Expectations" by earning 10 or more points. Faculty who obtain less than 6 points total in teaching in the five years preceding their mandatory tenure decision year will not be recommended for promotion and tenure.

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

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 these expectations through a combination of service activities within the College and external to the College as outlined in Appendix C. 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. 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. Faculty are responsible for documentation of service activities.

To earn a satisfactory rating in service and citizenship, untenured Assistant Professors are expected to earn an average of 1 point per year to continue appointment and be recommended for promotion and tenure (i.e., "Meets Expectations") as illustrated below. Faculty who obtain less than 5 points total in service in the five years preceding their mandatory tenure decision year will not meet the expectations for promotion and tenure.

	Unsatisfactory	**Needs Improvement**	**Meets Expectations**	**Exceeds Expectations**	**Signif. Exceeds Expectations**
Points earned over the past 5 years	2 and below	3-4	5-6	7-8	9 and above

Promotion to Full Professor or Full III

Associates may demonstrate their readiness for promotion to Full and Full Professors to Full III in different ways based on the mix of their contributions (regardless of their current workload profiles) as detailed below:

1) Significantly exceed expectations in either Research or Teaching and meet expectations in the remaining two dimensions.
2) Exceed expectations in two dimensions and meet expectations in the remaining one

Promotion to Full Professor profiles	Research	Teaching	Service
Strong research profile	Significantly Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations
Strong teaching profile	Meets Expectations	Significantly Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations
Balanced Research - Service profile	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Balanced Teaching - Service profile	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Balanced Research - Teaching profile	Exceeds Expectations	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations

These standards also apply to those faculty hired at the Professor rank who are applying for tenure. It is important that faculty make visible efforts to show progress over the entire period of review to be successful in obtaining promotion to Full Professor or Full III Professor.

Research

Below are the points associated with research performance (see Appendix A for Scholarly Output Equivalency Table)

	Unsatisfactory	**Needs Improvement**	**Meets Expectations**	**Exceeds Expectations**	**Signif. Exceeds Expectations**
Points earned over the past 5 years	4 and below	5-8	9-13	14-18	19 and above

The entire record of research will be taken into account for promotion. However, faculty who obtain less than 9 research points in the five years preceding their application to promotion and do not publish at least two articles designated as A or A* in the ABDC or Q1 in the SJR list will not be recommended for promotion to Full or Full III.

`

4

The following assumptions have been made:
a. Journals not on the ABDC list can be classified as accepted in the college, subject to other forms of validation as presented to, and approved by, the Research and Doctoral Committee. The committee will submit their recommendation to the Dean for final approval.
    i.   Acceptance rates
    ii. Published lists
    iii. Citation analysis appearing in refereed journals
b. Other considerations:
    i.   For all faculty, it is important to note that previous methods for evaluating publications will be respected for those articles currently in Revise and Resubmit status but will be published by December 31, 2021. All new publications should be targeted using the new standards. Therefore, faculty members will be able to make informed decisions about where to target and send their work.
    ii. Relevance to the faculty member's discipline will be taken into consideration when evaluating the portfolio of research.

Teaching

The table in Appendix B indicates ways in which a faculty member should demonstrate teaching performance. A minimum of six points in the five years preceding application for promotion is required for meeting expectations.

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

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 these expectations through a combination of service activities within the College and external to the College as outlined Appendix C. 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. 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. Faculty are responsible for documentation of service activities.

To earn a satisfactory rating in service and citizenship (i.e., a rating of "Meets Expectations"), Associate Professors are expected to earn a minimum of 2 points per year in service and Professors are expected to earn a minimum of 4 points per year in service.

For Associate Professors to be recommended for promotion, they must meet or exceed expectations during the five years prior to applying for promotion as illustrated in the table below. Associate Professors who obtain less than the average of 2 points per year during the five years preceding application for promotion will not meet the service expectations for promotion to Full Professor.

	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations	Signif. Exceeds Expectations
Points earned past 5 years	5 and below	6-9	10-12	13-15	16 and above

For Professors to be recommended for promotion to Full III, they must meet or exceed expectations during the five years prior to applying for promotion as illustrated in the table below. Generally, Professors who obtain less than the average of 4 points per year during the twelve-year period preceding application to promotion to Full III will not meet the service expectations for promotion.

	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations	Signif. Exceeds Expectations
Points earned past 5 years	9 and below	10 -19	20-24	25-30	31 and above

APPENDIX A

Scholarly Output Equivalency Table

List	Types of activity	Weight
I.	Refereed Journal Article A* from ABDC list	4
II.	PI or Co-PI on Externally Funded Research Grant with at least $20,000 overhead to COB (per grant) – This is equivalent to A*	4
III.	PI or Co-PI on Externally Funded Research Grant with at least $10,000 overhead to COB (per grant) – This is equivalent to A	3
IV.	Refereed Journal Article A from ABDC list or Q1 in SJR List	3
V.	Editor/Senior Editor of an A or A* Journal ((Maximum of 4 points in 5-year period)	2
VI.	Refereed Journal Article B from ABDC list or Q2 in SJR List	2
VII.	Scholarly book (initial publication) (does not include edited books)	2
VIII.	Editor/Senior Editor of a B or C Journal (Maximum of 3 points in 5-year period)	1
IX.	Refereed Journal Article C from ABDC list or Q3 in SJR List	1
X.	Other refereed journal articles or Q4 in SJR List	1
XI.	PI or Co-PI on Externally Funded Research Grant with no overhead to COB but no ($0) cost to the college	1
XII.	Associate Editor or Editorial Review Board of an A or A* Journal or National or International Conference Chair (Maximum of 3 points in 5-yr. period)	1
XIII.	Scholarly book chapter	1
XIV.	Associate Editor or Editorial Review Board of a B or C Journal or Regional Conference Chair (Maximum of 3 points in 5-yr. period)	0.5
XV.	Peer-reviewed national and international conference presentations (Maximum of 2 points in 5-yr. period)	0.25
XVI.	Peer-reviewed regional conference presentations (Maximum of 1 point in 5-yr. period)	0.25
Note: Additional items of scholarly activity may be <u>considered and potentially</u> added to the table, based on the recommendation of the RDC with approval by the Dean. For single-authored refereed journal articles, points will be multiplied by 1.25.		

Appendix B: 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	0.25 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: 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: Dissemination of new teaching techniques	1
Faculty Development: Evidence of effective mentoring of other faculty with respect to teaching	1
Faculty Development: Evidence of effective mentoring of doctoral students (beyond BUS 601 and 602) with respect to teaching	1
Faculty Development: Evaluation of and feedback for doctoral students after observing and teaching a course	0.5
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/Blended Courses, Case Studies and Exercises	0.5
Note: 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

`

Appendix C: Service and Citizenship Activities

Activity	Points
Union Executive Committee or Faculty Senate 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 (Associate Dean, Chair, Area Coordinator, Director, PhD Coordinator)	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
Serve as a major professor to a doctoral student	1
Serve as a thesis advisor to a master's student	1
Engage in a significant service activity associated with the initiatives in the COB strategic plan	1
Active member of university committee	0.5
Participate in annual reviews for area tenure-track faculty and participate in promotion, tenure, and third-year pre-tenure review for all COB tenure-track faculty	0.5
Participate in annual reviews for area non-tenure-track and participate in promotion for all non-tenure-track faculty in COB	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 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)	.5
Engagement in advancement/fund-raising activities	0.5
Serve as ad hoc reviewer of multiple peer-reviewed journal articles	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 of URI	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.	.25 -1

1. **Review Package (dossier)**
   A. The promotion package of each faculty requesting consideration for promotion and/or tenure 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 department chair (for TMD) or the COB Promotion and Tenure Committee (for everyone else).
   B. In addition to the required information, each faculty member is encouraged to submit a self-rating on Teaching, Research and Service 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 or department and can include an evaluation by any tenure track faculty member in the College.
      2. Each faculty member can also request an evaluation by any other area groups.
      3. Other faculty in the college are strongly encouraged to review all of their peers in the college that are under review.
   B. Information obtained from peer reviews
      1. The Promotion & Tenure Committee (or an appointed sub-committee) will develop a form to rate faculty performance consistent with the promotion and tenure standards as stated in the policy document.
      2. These forms will ask peers for information helpful in judging such things as the quality and impact of research, the extent to which courses are consistent with generic syllabi, and the quality of service.

3. **Committee Recommendation**- The promotion and tenure committee will provide the Dean with its recommendation for promotion and/or tenure along with its score on Teaching, Research, and Service. The committee will also provide the dean with its justification and rationale for each score.
   A. Each member of the Promotion and Tenure committee will review dossiers of each faculty seeking promotion. Based on (1) material presented by the candidate, (2) peer review information, (3) outside reviewer information, and (4) professional judgment, each member will evaluate each candidate on Teaching, Research, and Service.
   B. The Promotion and Tenure 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: Articles XV-XX in the URI/AAUP Collective Bargaining Agreement shall supersede any guidance provided in this document.