School of Business
University of Southern Maine

Criteria, Composition And Procedures of The School of Business Personnel Committee

I. COMPOSITION

The Personnel Committee of the School of Business shall consist of two members from the Department of Accounting and Finance and three members from the Department of Business Administration. All members of the Committee must be tenured. The chair will be elected from among Committee members for a term of one year.

Members may not vote on their own personnel action.

II. PROCEDURES FOR REVIEWS (See Appendix II for detailed process)

A. The Personnel Committee shall conduct annual reviews of each full-time, untenured department member, regardless of rank or status as permanent or fixed length. A personnel action for reappointment, promotion, or tenure shall constitute a review. Those members whose service will cease at the end of the current academic year need not be reviewed.

Any tenured member having the rank of Professor or Associate Professor shall be reviewed by the Committee every four years. At the written request of an individual faculty member, a review of that faculty member may occur more frequently than the normal four-year cycle.

B. The Personnel Committee is to receive from each department member supporting documents to be used in the review. Such documentation should include, but is not limited to (and may be subject to audit):
   1. Summary of student evaluations of faculty,
   2. Summary of intellectual contributions completed or in process, and
   3. Summary of university and community service.

C. The Personnel Committee may receive at its meeting to review a colleague, on a purely voluntary basis and at the discretion of School faculty colleagues in the reviewee’s discipline, oral comments that should include, but are not limited to, their evaluation of the reviewee’s performance in:
   1. Teaching
   2. Intellectual contributions; and
   3. Professional – related service internal and external to USM.

1 History: Document amended to reflect movement to a School-wide Personnel Committee as approved in the draft document titled “Reorganization Proposal” under the sub-heading Proposal for a School Level Personnel Committee at the April 6, 2007 School of Business meeting. This combined Personnel Policy document approved at 10/19/2007 SB meeting, except for teaching portfolio section; teaching portfolio section approved at 2/15/2008 SB meeting. Appendix III revised at 4/18/08 SB meeting. Section II.C. approved 10/17/08.
The reviewee and the Chair of the Personnel Committee must be given a minimum of one week’s notice of this appearance by colleagues. The reviewee will be present for, and will respond to, any such comments.

D. Review of each Department member shall be based upon performance in:
   1. Teaching;
   2. Intellectual contributions;
   3. Professionally-related service external and internal to USM.

E. Fixed length and part time faculty reviews:
   1. All fixed length faculty seeking reappointment will be reviewed on an annual basis;
   2. All part time faculty will be reviewed at the end of their first semester of teaching, and thereafter every four semesters of teaching. When faculty teach frequently, the review cycle can be extended to every two years. This review cycle may be initiated more frequently in response to student, faculty, or administrative concerns. Part time faculty will be evaluated only on their performance in teaching as described below in III.A and Appendix III.

III. REVIEW CRITERIA

In terms of a school-wide portfolio, we emphasize teaching approximately three times more than we emphasize either intellectual contributions or service, and the latter are equally emphasized. Where possible, work in each of these three areas should be conducted in partnership with the business community. In terms of individual reviews, the School recognizes that the relative importance of the three areas varies across individuals. Each faculty member in the School should be contributing in each of the areas of teaching, intellectual contributions, and service.

A. Performance in Teaching

1. Multiple types of evidence and sources of evidence facilitate effective review of the complex process of teaching. Evidence of teaching effectiveness will be provided by student assessments and self-assessment. Other important forms of assessment, such as peer assessment, may be provided. Factors the Committee may examine in the review of teaching include, but are not limited to:

   ▪ Course goals and content, including:
     - Compatibility with departmental curricular goals, educational objectives, and multi-section policies;
   ▪ Instructional methods and materials, including
     - Use of current, updated materials in class;
     - Use of new approaches and pedagogies and/or continuation of effective practices;
     - Assessment of students’ work;
   ▪ Appropriate contributions to the assessment of student learning (AOL), including:
     - Work performed in conjunction with the AOL steering committee to make courses available as AOL measuring opportunities;
     - Assistance provided in the measurement of programmatic
assessments;
- Course-embedded AOL data provided on a timely basis;
- Participation with colleagues to review data and make recommendations for both AOL process and curricular improvements;
- Supervision of internships, externally-based course projects, independent studies, and other forms of experiential learning;
- Evidence of other partnering activities consistent with the School of Business mission;
- New courses proposed and/or developed;
- Number of course preparations undertaken (including previous item);
- Workload implications of courses taught;
- Results of student evaluations;
- Availability to students and mentoring of students;
- Maintenance of currency in teaching area by participation in teaching development opportunities;
- Collegial sharing of teaching techniques and instructional content, and/or supporting other faculty members in teaching related matters;
- Participation in the Developmental Process for Teaching Improvement (described in Appendix I)

2. Rank-Specific Information Related to Teaching:

To be reappointed or promoted to one of the following ranks, a faculty member must perform at least satisfactorily on a composite of the items enumerated below for that rank.

a) Instructor:
   - Demonstrates competence and knowledge in the designated content areas of teaching.
   - Uses effective teaching methods, and demonstrates skill in instructional delivery.
   - Articulates a philosophy of teaching and learning and participates in the developmental process for teaching improvement (see Appendix I).
   - Seeks mentoring experiences when needed.

b) In addition for Assistant Professor:
   - Continues to develop competence and knowledge in areas of teaching.
   - Continues to develop a philosophy of teaching and learning, fully engages in the developmental process for teaching improvement, and uses faculty and student input to improve teaching effectiveness.

c) In addition for Associate Professor:
   - Demonstrates thorough professional competence and knowledge in areas of teaching.
   - Demonstrates thorough professional competence in instructional delivery, and professional competence in instructional design, evaluation, and revision.
   - Collegially shares teaching techniques and instructional content.
   - Meets his or her share of responsibilities regarding departmental educational objectives and curricular goals.
d) In addition for Professor:
- Maintains thorough professional competence and knowledge in areas of teaching.
- Maintains thorough professional competence in instructional design, delivery, evaluation, and revision.
- Maintains a high level of knowledge about current developments in the area of teaching and in the professional discipline.
- Highly engaged in helping others develop teaching skills.
- Highly engaged with departmental educational objectives and curricular goals.

B. Performance in Intellectual Contributions

1. Consistent with AACSB guidelines, the School defines the components of intellectual contributions as:
   a) **basic scholarship** - the creation of new knowledge;
   b) **applied scholarship** - the application, transfer and interpretation of knowledge to improve management practice and teaching- and
   c) **instructional development** - the enhancement of the educational value of instructional efforts of the institution or discipline.

The School’s primary focus for intellectual contributions will be in the areas of applied scholarship and instructional development including opportunities to partner with the business community where possible. However, basic scholarship is encouraged and highly valued.

In exceptional cases, expectations for intellectual contributions may be adjusted, on a preapproved basis, with a correspondingly adjustment in teaching/service workload (e.g., when the faculty member was tenured or promoted before substantial intellectual contributions were expected of all faculty.)

Factors the Committee may examine in reviewing intellectual contributions include, but are not limited to, publicly-available
- Refereed and non-refereed academic, professional, or educational journals;
- Monographs;
- Proceedings;
- Books and textbooks, or chapters within those books;
- Papers presented at conferences, meetings and public or in-house workshops;
- Other research or research working papers;
- Co-authorship and partnering scholarship in support of the SB mission;
- Consulting reports;
- Business plans;
- Industry white papers;
- Written cases with instructional materials;
- Instructional software and/or technology assisted instruction;
- Other instructional materials;
- Materials describing design and implementation of new courses;
- Grant proposals and awarded grants;
- Intellectual contributions derived from mentoring and other shared efforts, including co-authorships.
1. Rank-Specific Information Related to Intellectual Contributions

To be reappointed or promoted to one of the following ranks, a faculty member must perform at least satisfactorily on a composite of the items enumerated below for that rank.

a) Instructor:
   Applies instructional development research findings in teaching practices and disseminates research-based knowledge through teaching and/or practice.

b) In addition for Assistant Professor:
   • Develops and initiates an agenda for intellectual contributions.
   • Exhibits scholarly productivity.

c) In addition for Associate Professor:
   Demonstrates thorough professional competence in intellectual contributions in that:
   (a) a scholarly agenda has been maintained over time that produces on-going scholarly productivity over time, and
   (b) the scholar is developing a good reputation whereby peers recognize that the scholar has contributed to the body of knowledge in the discipline or instructional development field.

d) In addition for Professor:
   • Has developed and maintained a good reputation in that peers outside of Southern Maine recognize the scholar’s ongoing intellectual contributions to the field or recognize that the scholar’s intellectual contributions have influenced theory, policy, practice, pedagogy, or the scholarship of others.
   • Highly engaged in promoting and supporting intellectual activities within the school.

C. Performance in Professionally-Related Service to the External Business Community, Department, Program, School, University, and Academic Profession

Service can be generally defined as assistance or benefits afforded another. All faculty members are required to provide service to the university, external business communities and/or one’s profession. Service within these three areas supports the advancement of learning, application of best practices, the enrichment of campus culture, and development of one’s discipline. Service also provides opportunities to develop interdisciplinary collaboration, identify links in knowledge across disciplines, and facilitate the implementation of community partnerships. Service is considered an important part of a faculty member’s role. Distinction is drawn between service to the community as a faculty member and service as a private citizen. Service to the community should be directly related to, or flow from, the faculty member’s academic/professional expertise.

1. Factors the Committee may examine in assessing the service criterion include, but are not limited to:
a) External Business Community:
Effective participation with the business community, including:
• Providing consulting or professional practice in the community;
• Participation in organizations, advisory boards, boards of directors, and activities related to areas of professional expertise;
• Providing presentations or workshops for community and professional groups;
• Providing media interviews;
• Providing volunteer services or other forms of professional community service.

b) Department, Program, School, and University:
Effective participation in department/program/school/university committees and activities, including:
• Contribution to USM and SB Centers (e.g., SBCD, MCBER, E/SB);
• Contributions to AOL activities;
• Contribution to program development, implementation, and evaluation;
• Contribution to multiple programs;
• Development of publications such as newsletters, websites, brochures, program announcements;
• Contribution to other student-oriented initiatives (e.g., recruitment, retention, career assistance, internship site development, student organizations);
• Assistance to other faculty members including mentoring/advising junior faculty;
• Collegial support of department/program, school, and university needs (Professional collegiality at a reasonable level is expected of each department member. Professional collegiality is defined as cooperative interaction among colleagues, which is demonstrated by a combination of attitude and actions);

c) Academic Profession
• Service as editor or reviewer for professional publications, conferences, or media vehicles;
• Reviewing professional books and texts;
• Active participation and leadership in professional associations and conferences.

1. Rank-Specific Information Related to Service

To be reappointed or promoted to one of the following ranks, a faculty member must perform at least satisfactorily on a composite of the items enumerated below for that rank.

a) Instructor:
• Participates in department/program/school activities and committees related to area of expertise, as appropriate.
• Participates in appropriate student-oriented initiatives and professional activities.

b) In addition for Assistant Professor:
• Active in department/program/school committees and activities.
• Participates in curricular and/or program development and evaluation.
• Participates in service to the university, external professional community, and/or the profession.

c) In addition for Associate Professor:
• Contributes in department/program/school committees and activities.
• Contributes in program development, implementation, and evaluation.
• Contributes in university service.
• Contributes in service to the professional community and support of the School’s mission and/or the profession.

d) In addition for Professor:
• Contributes significantly on an on-going basis in department/program, school, and university activities.
• Contributes significantly in the development and evaluation of the curriculum.
• Contributes significantly in the development of faculty.
• Contributes significantly through external service in support of the School’s mission.

IV. DESCRIPTION OF RANKS

The levels of achievement necessary for reappointment or promotion to any particular rank are below. Faculty members seeking promotion are to meet satisfactorily the standards of the rank to which they would be promoted. (Below italicized language is School language that expands upon BOT definitions).

A. Lecturer: Lecturers are distinguished individuals or individuals, with professional ability whose appointments are part-time or temporary because of a limited need for their services. Appointments are on an annual or semester basis. Service at this rank shall not count toward fulfilling the probationary period for tenure, nor may tenure be granted at this rank.

B. Instructor: An instructor should be adequately prepared to perform teaching assignments successfully. Normally, the instructor should hold a Master’s Degree and be actively working to increase mastery of a discipline, or should have comparable qualifications. Appointment at this rank will not be renewed unless the individual demonstrates the qualities (in teaching, intellectual contributions, and service) desired in professional ranks. Continuous tenure will not be granted at the instructor rank.

C. Assistant Professor: An assistant professor must exhibit professional competence in teaching assignments, intellectual contributions, and service. The assistant professor should normally hold the highest earned degree traditional to the discipline, or the program in which the individual teaches or be actively working to increase a master of the discipline, or should have comparable qualifications. The assistant professor must have a demonstrated interest in maintaining and improving professional competence.
D. Associate Professor: The associate professor must have thorough professional competence and must have demonstrated creative professional performance. Normally, the associate professor should hold the highest earned degree traditional to a discipline or program in which the individual teaches or should have comparable qualifications. This individual should be in the process of establishing a good reputation in teaching and scholarly endeavors. The associate professor should be exhibiting leadership qualities that support the short-and long-term goals of the department.

E. Professor: The professor should, except in unusual circumstances, hold the highest degree traditional to a discipline. The professor must have demonstrated ability and scholarship of an exceptionally high order. As a teacher, the professor should show an extraordinary ability to stimulate in students a genuine desire for scholarly work. The professor should have a reputation for making creative contributions to scholarship in a field. The professor's reputation among peers should be more than local and should enhance the reputation of the University. The professor should be a leader within the department, having clearly demonstrated a willingness and capacity to assist in moving the department forward toward its short- and long-term goals.

V. OTHER

A. All faculty members in the School shall be reviewed on the basis of the preceding Sections I - IV. Faculty members must demonstrate at least satisfactory performance in each of the major categories in Section III (Teaching, Intellectual Contributions, and Service) when the evaluation concerns reappointment, promotion, or tenure. Post-tenure reviews primarily function as developmental review, but faculty are required to exhibit on-going professional competence in teaching, intellectual contributions, and service in terms of the review criteria that apply to a tenured faculty member.

B. The Department Chair may independently evaluate each faculty member but such evaluation will not carry any formal administrative weight.

C. Any change in this document shall not be implemented until the next academic-year following a decision to make such change by the School.

D. New faculty should be provided with a complete copy of this Personnel Policy as soon as they accept a position with the Department.

E. All requests for reappointment, promotion, tenure, sabbatical leave or leave of absence will be reviewed by this Committee, with a recommendation forwarded to the Department Chair for submission to the Dean.

F. Personnel actions of the School of Business Personnel Committee shall require an affirmative vote by paper ballot of at least a majority of the Committee members present and voting.
APPENDIX I

DEVELOPMENTAL PROCESS FOR TEACHING IMPROVEMENT

I. Peer Classroom Visitations

A. Guidelines

All faculty will be observed by a School of Business colleague in their classroom using the schedule detailed in I.B. The Department Chair will remind the Department of the need for observations. Arrangements for the observation will be made by the observed faculty member who will invite his/her own observers. Invited observers are free to decline. Every attempt should be made to minimize inconvenience to the faculty member being observed, and to maximize opportunity for formative development. To this end, the faculty member being observed may request that observers pay particular attention to and comment on specific areas that he/she wishes to have reviewed. Written feedback should be provided to the faculty member by each observer. The intent of the feedback should be for developmental and formative purposes only.

B. Visitation Cycles - Faculty members should be observed in accordance with the following schedule:

1. Full-time faculty
   a. New faculty - at least once during the first semester of their first year at USM.
   b. Fixed-length faculty and Assistant Professors - every two years.
   c. Associate Professors and Full Professors - every four years.

2. Part-time faculty -- see III.B.

If so desired to facilitate developmental feedback, any faculty member may arrange for additional peer classroom visits.

II. Teaching Portfolios

A. Guidelines

A teaching portfolio is a record of teaching activities and accomplishments for one faculty member summarized and prepared after collaboration with one or more colleagues. This record provides evidence of teaching effectiveness with a focus on the individual’s efforts in improvement of teaching. Preparation of the portfolio involves the collection of materials and the presentation in summary form of the evidence of a professor's collective work in teaching.

A typical teaching portfolio designed for formative and development purposes should address the following:

1. Teaching Responsibilities
2. Statement of Teaching Philosophy
3. Teaching Methodology, Strategies, Objectives
4. Description of Course Materials (Syllabi, Handouts, Assignments)
5. Efforts to Improve Teaching
   a. Conferences/Workshops Attended
   b. Curricular Revisions
   c. Innovations to Teaching
6. Student Ratings on Diagnostic Questions
7. Products of Teaching (Evidence of Student Learning)
8. Teaching Goals Short- and Long-Term
9. Appendices

B. Initial Preparation and Updating, Cycles

   Full time (tenure track, or tenured) - Teaching portfolios are expected to be created or updated at the halfway point between tenure-track appointment and expected tenure at USM, and when applying for promotion.

C. Documentation

   For post-tenure faculty, the teaching portfolio requirement can be met in full by the Documentation of Teaching section of USM’s Personnel Presentation Package. It is our expectation that faculty members will thoughtfully reflect on their teaching philosophy as they prepare their personnel presentations.

III. Development of Part-Time Faculty

A. Contact Person

   Each part-time instructor is assigned a departmental contact person who is typically in the same discipline as the part-time instructor. The contact person provides developmental support and administrative assistance as needed (e.g., scheduling coordination, syllabus review). The contact person is expected to contact the part-time instructor shortly after the assignment has been made and periodically thereafter. The contact person should acquaint the part-time instructor with the required developmental activities in III.B. and invite the instructor to participate in other developmental activities such as visiting classes taught by departmental members, attending workshops sponsored by the Center for Teaching, and attending School of Business Brown Bag sessions.

B. Required Developmental Activities

   By the end of the first semester of teaching and every four semesters of teaching thereafter, the instructor shall participate in one or more of the following developmental activities:
   
   1. Peer classroom visit (see I. above). The Department has a strong desire for this activity to occur, especially during the instructor’s first semester of teaching, but recognizes impediments such as summer teaching, teaching at satellite campuses, and the like.

   2. Teaching portfolio (see II. above)

      If an adjunct faculty wishes to prepare a teaching portfolio, he/she is welcomed to do so. At a minimum, the teaching portfolio should contain a statement of teaching philosophy and a description of methodologies,
strategies, and objectives.

3. Significant dialogue with a departmental member regarding course content, pedagogy, grading, the classroom experience, or related aspects of teaching.
### APPENDIX II

**Process for Pre-Tenure Reviews and Promotion Reviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chair identifies who is to be reviewed, and the review date, after consulting the Reviewee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reviewee prepares review package containing summaries of student evaluations, IC, and internal/external service. [Use format outlined in the USM guidelines for &quot;Individual Tenure and Reappointment Presentation,&quot; but condense as appropriate.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Two weeks before the review date, Reviewee places 5 copies of the review package in the mailbox of the School of Business Personnel Committee chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chair solicits comments from personnel committee members, and follows-up as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Personnel Committee members provide comments to the Chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>REVIEW (conducted in presence of Reviewee &amp; School of Business Personnel Committee): Chair makes opening remarks. Reviewee makes comments, if desired (e.g., brief summary of materials, supplemental thoughts, and/or requests for specific types of support or feedback.) Committee asks questions and makes remarks. If a personnel action is taken, committee votes by paper ballot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Reviewee gives a clean copy of the review package to the Chair. (Photocopied signatures are fine for developmental reviews and reappointments.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Chair prepares a signed, hard copy of the letter, which is forwarded to the Committee for comments, revisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Chair forwards package and letter to the Dean. Reviewee receives a copy of the letter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Process for Post-Tenure Reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chair identifies who is up for review and confirms the review date after consulting the Reviewee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reviewee prepares review package containing summaries of student evaluations, IC, and internal/external service. [Use format outlined in the USM guidelines for &quot;Individual Tenure and Reappointment Presentation,&quot; but condense as appropriate.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Two weeks before the review date, the Reviewee places 5 copies of the review package (and peer letters if desired) and workload plan in the mailbox of the School of Business Personnel Committee chair. The Reviewee can make a notation at the top of the package to request that written recommendations be provided, if any, for the Reviewee to be considered on track for promotion to full professor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Reviewee has a faculty colleague verify student evaluations &amp; occurrence of activities in the departmental &quot;Developmental Process for Teaching Improvement&quot; (e.g., portfolios &amp; peer visits – see P&amp;T document Appendix I in Greenbook)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Review (conducted in presence of Reviewee &amp; School of Business Personnel Committee): Reviewee makes comments, if desired Committee asks questions and makes remarks. Committee votes (by ballot) on whether or not the reviewee meets the standards for a tenured faculty member. If Reviewee requests, Committee generates &amp; votes (by ballot) on recommendations for Promotion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Reviewee gives a clean copy of the review package to the Chair. (photocopied signatures are fine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Chair forwards package &amp; transmittal letter (see template) to the Dean. Reviewee receives a copy of the letter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Template for Pre-Tenure Review & Post-Tenure Personnel Action Letters
(for pre-tenure reappointments & developmental reviews -- modify as appropriate for content and style)

Dear Dean:
The Personnel Committee of the School of Business met on XX/XX/XX to review the performance of Assistant Professor YYY. Consistent with the personnel policies of the Board of Trustees and the School, performance was reviewed in the areas of teaching, intellectual contributions, and professionally-related service to the Program, Department, School, University, community, and academic profession. {insert as appropriate, 'The emphasis of the review was on Professor YYY’s performance since the last review.’) Professor YYY is {insert details of current appointment such as ‘in the first year of a two year appointment,’} [so no personnel action is required] [and is eligible for a #-year reappointment]. The School Personnel Committee’s policy is to determine if performance “meets or exceeds” or “does not meet” School standards.

paragraph on teaching:
• discuss teaching effectiveness as evidenced by evaluations and other forms of evidence and occurrence of dept.’s "developmental process for teaching improvement” (e.g., peer visits & portfolio, if appropriate)
• mention areas, if any, that the Committee particularly commends or values (or areas of particular concern)
• In sum, the professor [does not meet] [meets or exceeds] School teaching standards for an Assistant Professor
• [and is on track for promotion and tenure.] [The School of Business Personnel Committee recommends XYZ for the professor to be on track for promotion.]

paragraph on IC: {the decision to include AACSB ‘AQ’ status is made on a case-by-case basis}
• mention major IC output/activity, especially refereed work and work since last review.
• mention areas, if any, that the Committee particularly commends or values (or areas of particular concern)
• In sum, the professor [does not meet] [meets or exceeds] School intellectual contribution standards for an Assistant Professor
• [and is on track for promotion and tenure.] [The School of Business Personnel Committee recommends XYZ for the professor to be on track for promotion.]

paragraph on service:
• mention major service activities, especially since last review
• mention areas, if any, that the Committee particularly commends or values (or areas of particular concern)
• In sum, the professor [does not meet] [meets or exceeds] School service standards for an Assistant Professor
• [and is on track for promotion and tenure.] [The School of Business Personnel Committee recommends XYZ for the professor to be on track for promotion.]

The School of Business Personnel Committee concludes that Professor YYY’s performance [does not meet] [meets or exceeds] School standards for an Assistant Professor. [The Committee voted unanimously (X/Y/Z) to recommend (against) reappointment of YYY as Assistant Professor of {insert discipline} for a #-year term, the maximum allowed under UMS policy. [If the recommendations listed above are met], the Committee feels that the professor is on track for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.

Respectfully, Chair, School of Business Personnel Committee

Template for Post-Tenure Review Letters Written by Chair (modify as appropriate for content and style)

The School of Business Personnel Committee met on XX/XX/XX to review the performance of [Associate] Professor YYY. Consistent with the personnel policies of the Board of Trustees and the School, performance was reviewed in the areas of teaching, intellectual contributions, and professionally-related service to the Program, Department, School, University, community, and academic profession. By [maintaining a teaching portfolio and allowing peer classroom visits], Professor YYY has [not] satisfactorily followed the department's developmental process for teaching improvement. The School of Business Personnel Committee’s s policy is to determine if performance “meets or exceeds” or “does not meet” standards. By a [unanimous] vote of X/X/X, the Committee concluded that Professor YYY’s overall performance [does not meet] [meets or exceeds] School standards for a tenured faculty member. [If an associate professor asks for recommendations to be considered on track for promotion to full professor, insert: YYY has asked for written feedback on performance to be considered on track for promotion to Professor. In the area of (teaching) (intellectual contributions) (service), [the professor is on track for promotion] [The Committee thanks Professor YYY for her/his contributions.]
All part-time faculty will be reviewed at the end of their first semester of teaching, and thereafter every four semesters of teaching. This review cycle may be initiated more frequently in response to student, faculty, or administrative concerns. When an adjunct faculty member teaches frequently, the review cycle can be extended to every two years. Also, if the instructor is a full-time member at another educational institution, developmental activities at the home institution can substitute for developmental activities for subsequent reviews. Part-time faculty will be evaluated only on their performance in teaching as described in III.A of the Criteria, Composition, and Procedures of the School of Business Personnel Committee. As per the School of Business Personnel Policies, the Department Chair is responsible for classroom visitation and review of continuing adjuncts, generally every fourth semester of teaching. The Department Chair is also responsible for first review of the adjunct’s continuing status as PQ or AQ. The Chair should obtain an updated resume and then forward it first to teaching discipline area faculty for their review as to whether the adjunct is maintaining PQ status, and then on to P&T Committee for its secondary assessment. The Associate Dean should annually remind the Chairs of this policy and their responsibilities for it.

A. The Department Chair maintains a record of teaching by part-time instructors, occurrence of required developmental activities, and occurrence of prior reviews. The Chair monitors these records to ascertain when part-time faculty are to be reviewed.

B. The review begins when student evaluations of teaching are released. The Chair – or other departmental member, at the Chair’s request – examines syllabi, student evaluations of teaching, record of participation in required developmental activities, and other personnel materials as appropriate (e.g., letters from students, prior review letters). The Chair and the departmental contact person assigned to the part-time instructor communicate with each other as to whether the performance "meets or exceeds satisfactory performance" or if there are areas of "concern." The contact person is responsible for alerting the instructor of the need to conform with syllabus guidelines.

1. If no substantive areas of concern are identified, the process ends, although the contact person is expected to maintain supportive contact with the instructor and provide positive and/or developmental feedback as appropriate.

2. If substantive areas of concern are identified, the Chair may establish and convene a Part-Time Faculty Member Review Subcommittee to review personnel materials and bestow an evaluation of "meets or exceeds satisfactory performance," "concerns," or "unsatisfactory performance." The subcommittee may request that the instructor provide additional evidence of teaching effectiveness and/or meet with committee before an evaluation is bestowed, and must provide these options before an evaluation of "unsatisfactory performance" is bestowed. Areas of concern shall be communicated to the instructor along with encouragement to participate in developmental activities. Unsatisfactory performance or ongoing areas of concern should be communicated in writing if the Program plans to offer similar courses in the future and the instructor wishes to continue teaching.
C. The Chair will periodically apprise the Department of the status of part-time reviews.

Unanimously approved by the School of Business Faculty on April 9, 2010