In general, The Business School follows closely the recommended standards of performance and teaching, research and service criteria as specified in the CU Board of Regents law, Article 5, Faculty (2014). More specifically with regards to standard of performance, in making appointment, reappointment, tenure and/or promotion recommendations, our primary unit evaluates each candidate’s performance in the following areas:

- The teaching ability of the candidate
- The scholarly and/or research work of the candidate
- The University service and leadership and public service of the candidate

The primary unit also takes into account other factors that have a material bearing on an appointment, reappointment, tenure, or promotion recommendation. The merit of the candidate is the primary consideration in recommendations for award of tenure. We also adhere to reappointment, tenure and promotion standards approved by the Board of Regents. These are:

1. **Reappointment**- Each tenure-track faculty member below the rank of associate professor shall be evaluated in a comprehensive manner, at least once during the tenure probationary period, apart from the review for promotion or the award of tenure. (Regent Laws Article 5.B.6.B.1) The comprehensive review is a critical appraisal designed to identify a candidate’s strengths and weaknesses in sufficient time to allow promising candidates to improve their records before the evaluation for tenure. The review may include evaluation by external reviewers, as determined by the campus/school/college/library policy. Candidates for reappointment may receive specific advice about aspects of their performance that need improvement, although non-reappointment is also a possible result of the comprehensive review.

2. **Tenure**- Tenure may be awarded only to faculty members with demonstrated meritorious performance in each of the three areas of teaching, research, and leadership and service to the University and the faculty member’s profession, and demonstrated excellence in either teaching, or research. The process leading to award of tenure is a summary evaluation of a faculty member’s cumulative performance and is a process that is separate and distinct from the annual merit performance evaluation. Professional/administrative service is weighed into any decision regarding tenure, but such activities in the absence of significant accomplishments in both teaching and scholarship are not an adequate basis for tenure.

3. **Appointment Criteria:**
   a. **Instructor**- Instructors should have the master’s degree or its equivalent and should be otherwise well-qualified to teach at the undergraduate (primarily lower division) level.
b. Senior Instructor- The rank of senior instructor gives higher recognition and salary and longer periods of appointment than that of instructor. It is awarded to faculty members who do not have the prerequisites for promotion to the rank of assistant professor but who have special abilities, usually in teaching.

c. Assistant Professor-Assistant professors should have the terminal degree appropriate to their field or its equivalent, plus some successful teaching experience. They should be otherwise well-qualified to teach at the undergraduate and graduate levels and possess qualifications for research in a special field.

d. Associate Professor- Associate professors should have the terminal degree appropriate to their fields or its equivalent, considerable successful teaching experience, and increasing accomplishment in research/scholarship, as articulated in the primary unit criteria.

e. Professor- Professors should have the terminal degree appropriate to their fields or its equivalent, and (A) a record that, taken as a whole is judged to be excellent; (B) a record of significant contribution to both graduate and undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances can be shown to require a stronger emphasis, or singular focus, on one or the other; and (C) a record, since receiving tenure and promotion to associate professor, that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching, research/scholarship, and service.

The Evaluation Committee
The Evaluation Committee assists the primary unit in making its recommendations on appointment, reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion. Our primary unit appoints from among its members an evaluation committee for each candidate being considered during an academic year.

A motion passed at the Spring 2006 Faculty Meeting states that committees for faculty reviews in the RTP process will be composed of three members, two from inside a candidate’s discipline and one from outside the candidate’s discipline. The members will be determined as follows:

- The Chair is chosen from the discipline by the candidate with mutual consent of the primary unit chair.
- The selection of one outside member is by the Primary Unit Chair.
- The selection of the second discipline member is done jointly by the Chair of the Committee and the Primary Unit Chair.

The committees may consist of both tenured and non-tenured members. Such committees take into account and carefully evaluate the following.

1. Information concerning the teaching ability of the candidate including the opinions of the candidate’s student and colleagues and other qualified individuals who may have observed the candidate’s classroom presentation;
2. The candidate’s scholarly and/or research efforts, including the opinions of colleagues and written publications that the committee examines thoroughly;

3. Opinions of others in the candidate’s field or in cognate fields who have particular knowledge of the candidate’s scholarly and/or research efforts;

4. The candidate’s University and public service including the opinion of colleagues and relevant others.

5. Any other information submitted by the candidate that the candidate believes will assure an adequate consideration and evaluation of his/her appointment, reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure;

6. The opinions in writing of scholars from outside the University and from various locations who are qualified to judge the candidate. Such outside opinions are mandatory in cases of recommendations for tenure and promotion. (Each candidate is asked to provide names of scholars that should be considered in selecting external reviewers, and members of a higher evaluation committee provide a separate list of names to present to the Primary Unit for approval.). Reappointment Tenure and Promotion (C.7.f.2): “At least six external letters of evaluation are required, with at most two selected from the candidate’s list, and at least four selected from outside the candidate’s list.”

Examples of appropriate criteria that we consider in evaluating teaching, research, and service are included in the Appendix.

After pursuing the procedures outlined above, the evaluation committee reports its findings concerning appointment, reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure to the primary unit. The primary unit meets in a plenary session, and each candidate’s case is discussed in depth. Following a secret ballot-vote, the Primary Unit makes its recommendation to the Dean on appointment, reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure. Only tenured members of the primary unit may vote on tenure and only full professors may vote on promotion to full professor.
Appendix
Business School Tenure and Promotion Guidelines

Promotion to Associate Professor with tenure involves the evaluation of research, teaching, and leadership and service. Reflecting the importance of this process, the Business School Primary Unit applies a rigorous assessment of documented accomplishments, along with consideration of the probability for sustained future productivity. In addition, the Primary Unit values collegiality and the candidate’s participation as a citizen of the University. Careful consideration is therefore given to the candidate's professionalism, character, and willingness to work cooperatively within the division, school, and campus. A recommendation for tenure should present a clear and compelling case for the merit of an application, leading to high confidence in the candidate’s prospects for continuing and meaningful contributions. The criteria detailed below seek to establish the parameters within which this decision is made.

Criteria for the Evaluation of Research

The goal of research in the Business School is to generate new knowledge that advances a field of inquiry or practice. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure requires that the candidate demonstrate and clearly document a record of high quality research that indicates the potential for sustained accomplishment throughout her/his career. In evaluating this record, the Primary Unit will consider both the candidate’s cumulative performance (including all work published prior to the probationary period) and the extent to which the candidate has demonstrated increasing accomplishment in research since joining the Business School.

- Cumulative performance: The Primary Unit will consider all publications, whether published at CU or at prior institutions. The research record should reflect the number of years in the candidate’s academic career.
- Increasing accomplishment: The Primary Unit expects the candidate to have published work consistently since joining the Business School. Candidates may demonstrate increasing accomplishment through many types of scholarly activities in addition to journal publications (e.g. other published scholarly work; journal or special issue editorship; late-stage revise and resubmits at elite journals; records of competitive honors and awards, grants, fellowships, and other acknowledgements; citations of the candidate's work; evidence of impact on policy and practice, etc.). The Primary Unit views “increasing accomplishment” as an increase in the candidate’s cumulative research accomplishments; not an increase in the rate of publications.
- The Primary Unit will also consider the quality of the published work, the interaction between articles in defined areas of research, and the impact of the candidate’s publications (as evidenced by citation counts, impact measures, and external letters).
• The faculty has expertise in the business disciplines and collectively the Business School Primary Unit forms a judgment about a candidate based on generally recognized norms of excellence in various business disciplines.
• The Primary Unit recognizes the scholarly norms that define Excellence in Research vary according to the discipline area within business (e.g., accounting, finance, management, marketing, information systems, business analytics, etc.). The Primary Unit therefore considers discipline-appropriate evidence of the significance of research.

The Business School puts substantial weight on refereed publications in the best discipline journals. In compiling a record of achievement, a candidate may be evaluated on different pathways. For example:

A. Premier publications -- a focus on publications in premier journals.
B. Balanced publications -- a mix of publications in premier journals, high quality journals, and other peer-reviewed journals.
C. Sub-discipline publications -- a focus in publishing in the high-quality journals in the candidate’s area of expertise.

For example, an evaluation of Meritorious in Research could be demonstrated by:
• A publication in a premier journal and at least one other peer-reviewed publication; or
• At least one publication in a high-quality, refereed journal and two to four publications in peer-reviewed journals.

For example, an evaluation of Excellence in Research could be demonstrated by:
• Two premier journal articles and one to three other peer-reviewed journal articles; or
• A single premier journal article and four to six other peer-reviewed journal articles; or
• Three high-quality journal articles and three to six other peer-reviewed journal articles;

All articles must be in print or accepted for publication at the time of submission of the dossier. The candidate is responsible for providing evidence of papers accepted for publication online or in press, including any conditions on acceptance.

The primary unit reserves the right to consider cases with substantial, externally-funded grants, or other significant scholarly activities that may substitute for some (but not all) peer-reviewed publications

Although single- or first-authored refereed journal articles are recognized as superior achievements, because it is the norm in some disciplines to list authors alphabetically, first-authorship or single authorship is not required but there should be evidence of independent intellectual contributions for a faculty member to receive an evaluation of either excellent or meritorious.
Quantity alone does not guarantee evaluation as meritorious or excellent. All scholarly activities will be evaluated based upon the candidate’s contribution to the publications, their quality (which may include prestige, significance, impact factors, citation counts programmatic nature, creativity, growth, discipline norms, etc.), as well as the total quantity. The body of work of a candidate for tenure must be judged against the appropriate standards within the area of research, balancing the significance and quality of the contribution with the quantity of publications and other scholarly products.

Definitions
- Premier Journals are those recognized by the community of scholars as the best in a field, as evidenced by rankings and other widely established criteria.
- High-Quality Journals are those recognized by the community of scholars as those that rank higher than most and just below premier status in that field, as evidenced by rankings and other widely established criteria.
- Peer-reviewed journals are journals that require a blind peer review process and publish research that has measurable impact on the field.

Criteria for the Evaluation of Teaching

For promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, candidates must demonstrate a sustained record of effective teaching or a record that demonstrates improvement in teaching.

Each candidate’s record of teaching is assessed according to student evaluation ratings, course rigor and difficulty, and program objectives. Quantitative data is presented in line with the example below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Times offered</th>
<th>Course Ratings</th>
<th>Instructor Ratings</th>
<th>GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programming, Data, File, Object Structures (ISMG 3200)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical program design &amp; implementation (ISMG 4800)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate (on-campus)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate (online)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduate Average (all)</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.18</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.34</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.47</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributed Object System Development (ISMG 6140)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>Average 1</td>
<td>Average 2</td>
<td>Average 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Multimedia Systems (ISMG-6040)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object-oriented Programming(ISMG 6020)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate Average</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Average</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other data to be considered include the following:
- Teaching awards
- Peer evaluation of teaching
- Preparation of course materials
- Course and curriculum design
- Student advising and mentoring
- Innovations in teaching
- Publications related to teaching
- Other significant accomplishments in teaching

For example, an evaluation of Meritorious in Teaching is demonstrated by:
- Evidence that clearly indicates the faculty member is an effective teacher whose teaching supports objectives, rigor, and difficulty that is consistent with program goals.
- Student evaluation scores at or above the midpoint of the scales.
- Faculty members with scores below the scale midpoints may demonstrate meritorious teaching by engaging in activities that serve to improve teaching and/or support the quality of the program they teach in as a whole.

For example, an evaluation of Excellence in Teaching is demonstrated by all of the following:
- A candidate meeting all of the criteria required for an evaluation of meritorious
- Superior teaching evaluations (well above the midpoint of the scale), accounting for course difficulty
- Other evidence of teaching quality which might include:
  - Teaching awards
  - Substantial student mentoring (e.g. supervising active student groups, Ph.D. committee participation etc.)
  - Innovation in teaching (e.g. demonstrates use of high-impact practices including but not limited to leading international courses, project based courses, etc.).
  - Other outstanding accomplishments in instruction.
- Demonstrating that the candidate’s teaching/pedagogy has impact beyond the university, which should include one or more of the following:
  - Publications related to teaching (e.g. innovative textbooks, or publication of peer reviewed journal articles related to teaching or pedagogy)
  - Other intellectual and widely disseminated contributions related to teaching (e.g. creation of workshops or short courses, development of new programs, development of a MOOC or online simulation, etc.).
The quantity of teaching-related activities does not guarantee evaluation as meritorious or excellent. All pedagogical work will be evaluated based upon its quality (prestige, significance, programmatic nature, creativity, growth, etc.), as well as overall quantity.

**Criteria for the Evaluation of Service and Leadership**

For promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, candidates in the Business School must demonstrate a record of service and leadership. However, candidates are not expected to engage extensively in leadership activities prior to tenure. The following activities are considered relevant:

- University Committees and Administrative Service
- Service to Profession and Discipline (State, National, and International level)
- Consultation and Public Service

For example, an evaluation of Meritorious in Service and Leadership is demonstrated by:

- Participation on relevant committees at the Discipline or other levels.
- Regular attendance at formal Business School meetings (discipline and faculty meetings).
- Participation in Business School and campus events and other relevant activities.
- Professional service, which may include but is not limited to reviewing papers for professional conferences or academic journals.

For example, an evaluation of Excellence in Service and Leadership is demonstrated by:

- A candidate meeting all of the criteria required for an evaluation of meritorious and
- Taking a leadership role in one or more service activities either in the Discipline, Business School, University, Community or Profession. This may include but is not limited to being a faculty advisor on an active student club, chairing a standing college or campus committee, serving as an officer for an academic interest group, or serving on the Editorial Board at a journal, or editing a special issue in a journal.

It is not sufficient to be involved in numerous service and leadership activities. The quality of the service and leadership activities must be high (i.e. effective and productive) as judged by evaluators.