NORTHERN ARIZONA UNIVERSITY | The W. A. Franke College of Business

Conditions of Faculty Service

This document contains The W. A. Franke College of Business (FCB) Conditions of Faculty Service.

INSERT CONTENTS HERE AND CHECK ALL PAGE NUMBERS

FCB Promotion and Tenure Committee (P & T Committee) and Business Annual Review Committee (ARC)

Process for elections of the FCB P&T Committee and Business Division ARC:

Consistent with the Northern Arizona University <u>Conditions of Faculty Service</u> (COFS), the faculty of The W. A. Franke College of Business (FCB), consisting of the Business Division and the School of Hotel and Restaurant Management (SHRM), agree to the following procedures and processes for promotion and tenure. Further, the FCB Business Division faculty agree to the following procedures for annual review within the Business Division.

The Northern Arizona Conditions of Faculty Service requires the following for the P&T Committee (Sec.B.2.1)

1. At least three members.

2. Committee members must be full-time tenured faculty.

3. All full-time tenured and tenure-eligible faculty may vote in elections for committee members.

4. Members will serve three-year staggered terms so that approximately one-third of the members are elected each year.

5. Deans and Department Chairs are ineligible to serve.

6. Each area shall have at least one representative on the committee.

7. Elections can be at either the area or college level.

8. This committee may also serve as the Annual Review Committee (ARC).

The FCB faculty have agreed that the P&T Commmittee will consist of the six tenured members of the Business ARC elected as indicated below plus one tenured faculty member elected by the School of Hotel and Restaurant Management. The FCB faculty have agreed that the foregoing requirements stated in COFS for the election of P&T Committee members will apply to the election of P&T committee with the following clarifications:

1

1. All full-time tenured,tenure-eligible, and non-tenure eligible FCB faculty may vote in elections for committee members.

2. The full-time tenured,tenure-eligible, and non-tenure eligible Business Division faculty will elect one member from each of the academic areas to serve on the P&T Committee.

3. The chair of the committee will be a member who only has one-year remaining on the P&T Committee whenever possible in order that the chair will have two years of service on the P&T Committee before serving as chair.

4. Whenever possible, a faculty member shall not be eligible to serve on the P&T Committee again until after the expiration of three years following their term of service on the committee. "Term of Service" shall not include a one-semester or one-year fill-in for a faculty member in their area (e.g., one who is on sabbatical or one who is being considered for promotion during that year).

5. A separate election will be conducted to replace a faculty member on the P&T Committee who is on sabbatical leave or other academic leave (e.g. a Fulbright) for any part of that faculty member's term of service. The replacement member will serve during the period of time when the original member is on sabbatical. A faculty member who has served as a replacement member on the committee shall be eligible for election to a full-term at the time of the next vacancy from that Area.

6. A separate election will be conducted to replace a faculty member on the P&T Committee who retires or otherwise leaves the college before that faculty member's term of service expires. The replacement member will complete the term of the original member. A faculty member who serves as a replacement member on the committee for less than half of the original term shall be eligible for election to a full-term at the time of the next vacancy from that Area.

7. If the elected P&T Committee does not include at least one female or male, the FCB faculty will elect a 7th member at-large from among the eligible faculty members (male or female as appropriate) to serve until another appropriate member is elected through the normal election process or for a maximum of three years at which time another at-large election will be held.

8. The Dean, Associate/Assistant Deans, and the SHRM Executive Director are not eligible to serve.

9. Faculty members going up for promotion may not participate in the review of their promotion application, and may recuse themselves for all promotion and tenure evaluations that year.

The Northern Arizona University Conditions of Faculty Service (COFS) requires the following for the Annual Review Committee (ARC) (Section B.3.1.):

1. At least three members.
2. In non-departmentalized colleges, each area has at least one representative on the ARC.
3. Each academic unit will establish clear written policies governing the composition of its ARC.

The FCB Business Division faculty have agreed that the makeup of the ARC for the Business Division faculty will be composed as follows:

1. The ARC for the Business Division faculty will consist of the Business Division faculty members of the P&T committee plus two additional elected faculty members.
2. The two additional members will be elected from the current non-tenure eligible Business Division faculty with the ranks of Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Principal Lecturer, Assistant Professor of Practice, Associate Professor of Practice, or Professor of Practice who will have taught full-time in the FCB for at least three years by the time their term begins.

3. All full-time Business Division faculty, including one-year full-time instructors, may vote in the election of the two additional ARC members.

4. The non-tenure eligible members will serve three-year staggered terms.

5. The two faculty members may not be from the same academic area. Faculty from the academic area represented by the continuing member on the ARC shall not be eligible to serve.

6. The election will occur in two stages. All eligible faculty names will appear on the initial ballot. The names of the three faculty members receiving the highest number of votes in stage one will appear on a second round of voting to determine the outcome unless a faculty member receives over fifty percent of the votes in stage one of the balloting.

7. The Dean and Associate/Assistant Deans are ineligible to serve.

8. A separate election will be conducted to replace either non-tenure eligible faculty member on the ARC who retires or otherwise leaves the college before that faculty member's term of service expires or who goes on sabbatical during the term of service. The replacement member will serve only during the sabbatical or will complete the term of the original member who has left the college. A faculty member who serves as a replacement member on the committee for less than half of the original term shall be eligible for election to a full-term at the time of the next vacancy from that Area.

Annual Review Policies & Procedures
For Business Division Faculty

Scope of Evaluation

The purpose of the Business Division faculty performance evaluation system is to identify, assess, and enhance performance. The evaluation process incorporates guidelines relevant to the achievement of the academic goals and objectives of teaching, advising, mentoring, scholarly activity, professional development, and professional service.

Faculty performance evaluations will take several forms. For tenured faculty these include annual review and promotion review. For tenure-eligible faculty these include annual review, probationary (retention) review, promotion review, and tenure review. For non-tenure-eligible faculty these can include annual review, reappointment review, and promotion review.

Part-time faculty members are reviewed for continued teaching by the Associate Dean and/or Dean with input from the Area Coordinators and/or course coordinators. Decisions to re-engage part-time faculty members are at the sole discretion of the Associate Dean and/or Dean. Part-time faculty members are evaluated on teaching quality, rigor, and appropriate grade distributions.

Changes to this Section

Any changes to the Annual Review Policies and Procedures for Business Division Faculty must be approved by a majority of the Business Division Faculty. All tenured, tenure-track, and full-time non-tenure track faculty may vote in an election related to the changes to this section. One-year instructors and part-time faculty are not eligible to vote on changes to this section.

Calendar for Performance Evaluation Procedures

Evaluation periods are in accordance with the Personnel Action Calendar, prepared annually by the Provost and furnished through the Deans to all academic units conducting evaluations. Published dates for review of tenured, tenure-eligible, and non-tenure-eligible faculty should be set by university policy by

the administration on or before the first day of the fall semester. This calendar will specify the due dates for faculty submission, committee consideration and recommendations, administrators' consideration and recommendations, and actions by the Provost and President. The Personnel Action Calendar can be accessed at http://nau.edu/provost/.

For the purposes of Probationary Review, "first" and "second" year for tenure-eligible faculty shall be determined by years of service as NAU faculty regardless of years of prior service agreed to at the time of hire.

Personnel Involved with Faculty Evaluation

Depending on the type of review, the personnel involved with faculty evaluation may include

1. Faculty member
2. Area Coordinator
3. Annual Review Committee
4. Promotion and Tenure Committee
5. Dean
6. Provost
7. President

Statement of Expectations

Normally, all tenured, tenure-eligible, and non-tenure-eligible faculty, whether full- or part-time appointees, must have a Statement of Expectations (SOE) that will be used as the basis for performance evaluations. Exceptions to this policy may exist for part-time faculty. The SOE will encompass the faculty member's anticipated activities for the time period under university contract indicating the percentage of effort devoted to the activities. It will include or otherwise refer to formal, written criteria determined by the academic unit that will be the basis for the evaluation of faculty performance in that unit, both annually and for retention, promotion, or tenure, as appropriate. The SOE for those faculty who have administrative assignments (faculty with administrative appointments, area coordinators, and course coordinators) will enumerate these responsibilities, indicate the percentage of effort devoted to them in the "Other" category, and establish the criteria for evaluation of their administrative performance with the Dean or Executive Director. SOEs are the result of negotiation between the faculty member and the Dean. By April 1 of each year, all FCB faculty will have an SOE covering the next academic year contract. SOE's will be used as the basis for faculty performance evaluations.

The SOE of each faculty member must be compatible with and be based on the most current version of the NAU Conditions of Faculty Service document; the current FCB mission statement; current AACSB guidelines and standards; and the college's specific guidelines herein.

Creating a Statement of Expectations

An SOE should be constructed utilizing the education, skills, and talents of the faculty member as they relate to the mission and needs of the area, college and/or the university. The performance of the faculty member will be measured within the context of his/her SOE.

The SOE is to be developed by the faculty member and submitted through the Faculty Activity and Achievement Reporting System (FAAR) system. Once the Dean and the faculty member come to a

common understanding and agreement to the expectations for the forthcoming contractual period, the Dean will approve the SOE in the FAAR system. If edits need to be made, the Dean's office will reopen the SOE for the faculty to make the changes. If the faculty member and relevant administrators cannot come to an agreement by the end of the academic year, the faculty member will be deemed to have a "normal workload allocation" for his or her position. A normal allocation would be an allocation of Student-related activities/Scholarship/research/creative activities and/or Professional Development/Service activities/Other of 80/10/10/0 for non-tenure track lines and 60/20/20/0 for tenure/tenure-track lines.

1. <u>Student-related activities</u>. Specific classes should not be identified as schedule changes would necessitate amending the SOE. Credit hours being taught each semester should be included in the SOE. Expectations regarding non-classroom related responsibilities to students should be detailed.

2. <u>Scholarship/research/creative activities and/or professional development</u>. Accreditation requirements mandate all Business Division faculty members have some expectation in this regard. The Intellectual Contributions matrix can be found on page ___of this document; the Professional Qualifications matrix can be found on pages _____ of this document. Because working papers count in the mass of intellectual contributions, all working papers should be submitted to the FCB Working Paper Series. Include specific detail regarding planned activities in this area.

3. <u>Service activities</u>. All faculty members, with the exception of part-time faculty members and first-year faculty members, will have some expectation of service to the FCB. The SOE should list specific committee assignments where possible, particularly for those service assignments outside of the FCB.

4. <u>Other (e.g., administrative assignments)</u>. Faculty members who have administrative assignments should detail those duties in the "Other" section of the SOE. Descriptions of the administrative assignments should be specific. Course coordination and service as an Area Coordinator/Graduate Coordinator are considered "Other" duties. "Other" activities are not evaluated for performance quality by the P&T Committee or the ARC but are evaluated by the Dean with appropriate input. Activities in the "Other" category may be considered by the P&T Committee and/or ARC in determining whether a faculty member has earned an overall rating of meritorious or highly meritorious.

5. <u>Allocation of Effort</u>. In general, the faculty member and the Dean will agree on the faculty member's planned distribution of effort. The distribution of effort will be made among the four traditional faculty focus areas in the FCB: Student-related activities; Scholarship/research/creative activities and/or professional development; Service activities; and Other duties. The distribution of effort will be consistent with the objectives of the faculty member's academic area (e.g. finance, accounting, etc.) and the overall mission of the College. This does not mean that each faculty member will have the same allocation of effort. However, the allocation of effort among all of the faculty in a given academic area (when looked at in total) will be consistent with and supportive of area (when looked at in total) objectives and the college mission.

   Generally a faculty member will distribute some effort to each of the faculty focus areas with the exception of Other (e.g. administrative assignments). However, exceptions to this will occur (for example, first year tenure-track faculty should have a service allocation of zero or close to zero). Lecturers, who typically are required to teach 12 hours each semester, will allocate 80 percent to Student-related activities, 10 percent to Professional Activity and 10 percent to Service. Moreover, tenured and tenure-eligible faculty might on occasion have a zero weight in one of the other areas during a given year. Regardless of weights decided upon, all full-time faculty are expected to perform at least normal service to the university each year (e.g. attend area and college-level faculty meetings, attend Commencement, serve on committees, etc.). Allocations during sabbatical will be appropriate

for the sabbatical activities and faculty members on sabbatical typically will have a 0% allocation in Student-related activities and Service.

The amount of effort that will be allocated in Student-related activities is dependent upon teaching loads. For example, faculty members teaching 12 hours/semester in both the Fall and the Spring likely will allocate 80 percent of their effort (time) to Student-related activities. In FAAR system, the 80% should be recorded entirely under "Formal Class/Lab." Assuming no special circumstances, the teaching load and allocation weight will generally be as follows:

Effort Allocation Guidelines

Administratively Assigned Faculty

Administratively assigned faculty include the Associate/Assistant Deans, Graduate Coordinator, Area Coordinators, Course Coordinators and perhaps the chair of some FCB or university committees (e.g. the chair of the University Undergraduate Committee). The allocation of effort for adminstratively assigned faculty will vary greatly depending on the assignment. Typically, Student-related activities will equal 10% for each class the faculty member teaches during the year, Scholarhip/research/creative activities and/or Professional Development should be at least 10%, and there may be a 0% allocation to Service Activities depending on the administrative assignment.

Non-Tenure-track Instructors, Lecturers and Professors of Practice with no Administrative Assignment

Hours Taught	*Effort Allocation*	*Effort Allocation*	*Effort Allocation*
During Academic Year	**Student-related activities**	**Scholarship/reaserch/creative activities and/or Professional Development**	**Service activities**
12 (1/2 time)	80%	10%	10%
18 (3/4 time)	80	10	10
21	70	10-20	10-20
24	80	10	10

Tenured and Tenure-Track Non-Administratively Assigned Faculty

Hours Taught	*Effort Allocation*	*Effort Allocation*	*Effort Allocation*
During Academic Year	**Student-related activities**	**Scholarship/reaserch/creative activities and/or Professional Development**	**Service activities**
3	10%	80%	10%
6	20	70	10
9	30	60	10
12	40	50	10
15	50	40	10
18	60	20-30	10-20
21	70	10-20	10-20
24	80	10	10

Revising the Statement of Expectations

If, during the period covered by the SOE, there are significant changes in the faculty member's responsibilities or the faculty member has experienced significant changes in individual circumstances, then the SOE may be revised through a negotiation process involving the faculty member and the relevant administrator(s).

The revised SOE must be updated and approved by the Dean in the FAAR system to be considered the statement of record against which performance is evaluated unless the revised SOE has become operative without the signature(s) as provided above.

Tenure-Eligible and Tenured Faculty

Unless otherwise specified, the SOE for tenure-eligible and tenured faculty will set forth the workload assignment, including percentage of effort that is anticipated in each of the following areas for the contract period:

1. Student-related activities (to include at least teaching, and may include advising, mentoring, and student supervision);

2. Scholarship/research/creative activities and/or Professional Development;

3. Service activities, including service to the profession, university (including NAU/FCB/Area) and to the community (local, state, national, and international) as it relates to the mission and guidelines of NAU, the FCB, and the profession; and

4. Other (e.g. administrative assignments).

Faculty Members Not Eligible for Tenure

SOEs for faculty who are not eligible for tenure will be developed to reflect the specific responsibilities for which those faculty have been employed.

Part-time and temporary faculty will normally have duties enumerated at the time of hire. The SOE for these faculty members typically is the offer of employment letter which should be uploaded in to the FAAR system.

Faculty Members Serving More than One Discipline

SOEs for faculty members who serve more than one discipline should clearly specify the allocation of each faculty member's efforts that will be assigned to each of the academic units served. The SOE specifies how the allocations will be reflected in the evaluation process in each of the evaluation areas listed above.

Workload Assignment

Assignments are negotiated annually and described in the SOE.

Professional Review File
From NAU COFS Section 1.4.5.2

Typically, there are three types of files related to personnel: the Professional Review File (PRF) which is used in the faculty evaluation processes, the Personnel File which contains the standard hiring and

reappointment forms, and Supervisory Files which are used by administrators to hold notes and materials that are informal in nature and not included in the PRF. Only the PRF and any letters of reference for which the faculty member has waived access may be considered in the evaluation processes

The Dean has the responsibility to maintain PRFs for all faculty members within The W. A. Franke College of Business regardless of the nature of their appointments. The PRF may contain hard copies of documents as well as documents included in the FAAR system. Only the faculty member whose records are involved, appropriate administrators and staff, and evaluation committee members shall have access to the Professional Review File unless release to others is required as a matter of law or to represent the interests of NAU such as in an appeal, complaint, or grievance procedure. The PRF shall include at least the following:

1. All SOEs and any amendments to these documents;

2. Each Annual Faculty Performance Report filed by the faculty member. The faculty member will retain all supporting material, documents, productions, and/or creations evidencing activity and/or recognition in the areas referred to in the SOE. These materials must be available for review upon request by any evaluating committee/administrator;

3. Results of formal student, peer, and administrator evaluations including recommendations and/or decisions relating to the faculty member resulting from such evaluations;

4. All letters or documents written by faculty, students, committees, and/or administrators that will be considered in the evaluation process. A copy of any such material shall be given to the faculty member at the time it is placed in the file;

5. Application materials for promotion and/or tenure, including vitae. The faculty member will retain all supporting material, documents, productions, and/or creations evidencing activity and/or recognition in the areas referred to in the SOE. These materials must be available for review upon request by any evaluating committee/administrator;

6. Material relevant to the evaluation or review of a faculty member, by the ARC, P&T committee, or any other relevant committee, including materials relating to leaves of absences and sabbaticals;

7. Any other relevant materials the faculty member may wish to include in the file such as letters of support or reference, records of outside funding, evidence of awards and professional recognition, and responses to any other material in the file.

Any materials, such as letters of reference, that are received into the file with an understanding that access has been waived shall remain confidential and in a separate file, not available for review by the faculty member. In addition, any materials required by law to be maintained as confidential shall remain confidential and separate from the PRF. No material other than the items listed above shall be placed in the faculty member's PRF and nothing shall be placed in the PRF without the knowledge of the faculty member. The faculty member shall be provided with a copy of any material placed in the PRF by someone other than the faculty member. Materials received with an understanding of confidentiality agreed to by the faculty member remain in a separate file not available for review or challenge by that faculty member. A faculty member shall have the right to challenge, in writing, the accuracy of material included by others in the PRF. Such a challenge or objection shall be addressed in writing to the Dean. If the faculty member wishes to appeal the response of the Dean, he or she may do so in writing to the Provost. The Provost will provide the faculty member with a written response within ten (10) days.

By mutual agreement between the faculty member and the Dean, material previously placed in the PRF may be removed and placed in the supervisor's file.

Workload Form

Business faculty will complete the Workload Form for each term using the FAAR sytem in use by NAU by the date specified in the *Personnel Action Calendar* (prepared annually by the Provost). Each faculty member is responsible for entering relevant information into the FAAR specifically addressing the areas referred to in the SOE and the workload assignment described therein for the evaluation period.

In addition to completion of the online form, each faculty member will attach in the FAAR the following documents:

- Annual Review Self-Evaluation Form (attached as Appendix E)
- PQ Matrix (for Practice Academics and Instructional Practitioners)

The Annual Self-Evaluation Form shall contain the following materials:

1. For the evaluation of Student-related activities when undergoing a full review of teaching, the faculty member will supply the following materials:

   a. Syllabi, representative exams and assignments, and grade point averages.

   b. Every annual review will include course evaluations by students and every faculty member is expected to be evaluated on every course, every semester. Evaluation material will be provided to the faculty member so that the faculty member can include any explanations in the Annual Self-Evaluation Form. Where possible, the Dean's office will upload the teaching evaluation materials in to the FAAR system.

   c. Explanations about deviations from normal performance, high or low GPAs, and any additional information that would be pertinent for the facutly member to share.

2. For the evaluation of Scholarship/research/creative activities and/or Professional Development, the faculty member will provide the following documents as appropriate:

   a. Copies of acceptance letters for any publication;

   b. Copies of articles accepted for publication (or links to the articles if they also were published during the evaluation period);

   c. Information on professional development activities not captured in the PQ Matrix.

   d. Information on any working papers or works currently under review.

3. For the evaluation of Service activities, the faculty member will supply a list of his/her service activities and an indication of the amount of time devoted to each service activity. Service activities include service to the profession, area/ college/ university, and to the community as these activities relate to the mission of the university as defined in a faculty member's SOE and any other relevant materials selected by consensus within the unit.

4. For the evaluation of Other activities (e.g. administrative assignments), the faculty member will provide evidence of that activity as appropriate to the agreement with the Dean.

5. A faculty member may provide additional materials related to the areas listed above as part of his/her self-evaluation form. For example, a faculty member may include award letters for publications (e.g. "best case" award for a case or best paper in a volume of a journal), information on impact of a publication accepted, information on professional development activities not adequately discussed elsewhere, and similar items.

6. Failure to provide the required materials will result in a rating of unsatisfactory by the Annual Review Committee.

Annual Review Guidance

Evaluations of faculty members must be based upon the documentation available in the PRF, including material that the faculty member provides to clarify any documents placed in the PRF. Approved college criteria provides the basis for the judgment of faculty performance. FCB college criteria begins on page ___ of this document.

All faculty who have less than full-time administrative assignments will be evaluated annually by faculty peers and appropriate administrators. In addition, full-time administrators who are teaching courses and generating intellectual contributions or professional development activities may be reviewed in those categories by faculty peers at the request of the faculty member or Dean. The Annual Review shall be conducted during the semester following the year being evaluated. For first-year faculty, the first year's review will encompass only the first semester. The Annual Review shall focus upon: 1) the SOE (or the Letter of Hire for first-year faculty), and (2) the Annual Review Self-Evaluation Form (with attachments) and shall be based on the criteria and standards set forth by the FCB, NAU, and the Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR). These criteria have been approved by the Dean and Provost and are available to the faculty member.

The Workload Form for the prior academic year is due each fall in accordance with the *Personnel Action Calendar* (http://nau.edu/provost/). The Annual Review will be conducted by the ARC and the Dean.

The Annual Review shall be based on performance in the areas specified in the Statement of Expectations (Student-related activities; Scholarship/research/creative activities and/or Professional Development; Service activities; Other). All faculty members are expected to maintain levels of professional activity appropriate to their disciplines to ensure that they will remain current in their disciplines and capable of delivering present and future curricula.

Annual Review Procedures

1. The Dean will provide faculty members with a list of dates for the Annual Review.

2. Performance shall be evaluated overall, and specifically in the areas of

   a. Student-related activities (including teaching, and any advising and mentoring),

   b. Scholarship/research/creative activities and/or Professional Development,

   c. Service activities (including service to area/FCB/NAU/profession, and to the community as these activities relate to the mission of the university), and

   d. Other (e.g. administrative assignments).

3. Every faculty member shall be evaluated in each of the areas specified on a four point scale, with one (1) corresponding to an unsatisfactory rating, two (2) corresponding to a satisfactory rating, three (3) corresponding to a meritorious rating, and four (4) corresponding to a rating of highly meritorious. No faculty member can be rated unsatisfactory overall unless he or she is rated unsatisfactory in one or more areas. Whether a rating of unsatisfactory in one or more areas is a basis for an overall evaluation of unsatisfactory will depend upon the percentage of the faculty member's efforts assigned to those area(s) in the SOE and the application of the applicable criteria to the faculty member's performance.

Steps in the Annual Review Process

1. Faculty submit the Workload Form and attachments in the FAAR system and any supporting materials to the Dean by the date specified in the Personnel Action Calendar.

2. The Dean reviews materials for completeness and, when determined to be complete, forwards the materials to the ARC.

3. The ARC shall review the materials and provide a written recommendation to the Dean and a copy of the recommendation to the faculty member.

4. Upon receipt of the recommendation of the ARC, the faculty member shall have the option to:

    a) Submit a written response to the Dean within seven (7) days of receipt of the written recommendation, or

    b) Make no response and accept the evaluation as presented.

5. The Dean uses the performance of each faculty member as well as the recommendation of the ARC to complete the Annual Review for each faculty member. A copy of this Review shall be placed in Faculty 180 once the review by the Dean is completed.

6. If the faculty member is dissatisfied with the Dean's Annual Review, the faculty member may submit an appeal with appropriate documentation to the Provost within seven (7) days of receipt of the evaluation. The decision of the Provost is final.

7. If a tenured faculty member receives an overall unsatisfactory performance rating or in a single evaluation category for a single year the post tenure review process is initiated (described in further detail on pages _____).

Merit Policy and Exemplary Employee

The basis for any college-controlled merit raises, including those for first-year faculty, shall be the Annual Review. Should merit funding not be available annually, evaluation for merit increases will be based on the three immediately preceding years or on the period since the previous merit distributions, whichever is shorter.

If the faculty member is dissatisfied with the merit decision of the Dean, the faculty member may submit an appeal with appropriate documentation to the Provost. The Provost will review the appeal and supporting documentation. The decision of the Provost is final. More information on merit can be found on page __.

The basis for any Exemplary Employee designation will follow the criteria as established by the Provost. Should the FCB be allowed to nominate or select exemplary faculty for salary increases, the Dean will distribute the criteria and definition of exemplary from the Provost to the Annual Review Committee that will nominate individuals for consideration as Exemplary Faculty based upon the ratings generated by the committee for the evaluation period. After receiving the feedback from the ARC, the Dean will nominate the appropriate number (as designated by the Provost) of faculty to the Provost. Regardless of the feedback from the ARC, the nomination of a faculty member to the Provost is within the discretion of the Dean.

Faculty Rating Criteria for Annual Reviews

The Northern Arizona University <u>Conditions of Faculty Service</u> (COFS) requires the following for the Annual Review:

All faculty who have less than full-time administrative responsibilities will be evaluated annually by faculty peers and appropriate administrators. The Annual Review shall be conducted during the semester following the year being evaluated. For first-year faculty, the first year's review will encompass only the first semester. The Annual Review shall focus on: (1) the Statement of Expectations, and (2) the Annual Faculty Performance Report and shall be based on the criteria and standards set forth by the individual units, the University, and ABOR. These unit criteria must be approved in writing by the Dean and Provost before implementation and will be made available to the faculty member. (Sec. 1.4.6.1.1)

The Business Division faculty have agreed that any faculty member with a full-time administrative assignment who also teaches will be evaluated by the ARC for those categories where it is appropriate. Normally this will include Student-related activities and Scholarship/Research/Creative activities and/or Professional Development. The ARC does not evaluate administrative work or responsibilities.

Review of Faculty on Sabbatical During the Evaluation Period

Faculty on sabbatical for the entire evaluation period shall be evaluated only on their performance in the area of Scholarship/research/creative activities and/or Professional Development as established in the SOE document for the faculty member. This component will represent 100% of their evaluation. The faculty member's performance in this category will be based on their successful completion of their sabbatical activities and their performance compared to the rating criteria for the Scholarship/research/creative activities and/or Professional Development category.

Faculty on sabbatical for a portion of the evaluation period will be evaluated on the basis described above for the portion of the evaluation period when they were on sabbatical.

Student-related activities

Framework

Faculty members receive an annual evaluation of Student-related activities. There are two types of evaluation:

1. Abbreviated Evaluation: Tenured faculty members who receive a rating of meritorious or highly meritorious in Student-related activities will maintain that rating for two years after receiving that rating unless the faculty member meets one of the criteria below for a comprehensive evaluation. During an abbreviated evaluation, the ARC only reviews student course evaluations for significant deviations from past terms.

2. Comprehensive Evaluation: All tenured faculty members receiving a rating of satisfactory or unsatisfactory in Student-related activities, all untenured tenure-track faculty, and all non-tenure eligible faculty will receive a comprehensive evaluation of Student-related activities each year. Tenured faculty will receive a comprehensive evaluation at least once every three years. Comprehensive evaluation in the Student-related activities category will be based upon the Evaluation Criteria included in this document as Appendix A. The ARC will use that criteria, with evidence from the following sources, to determine the evaluation in this category:

a. Evaluation of instructional design, including a review of teaching materials such as course syllabi, sample exams, sample assignments, and any other teaching materials provided in the Workload Form or Self-Evaluation. This will include a review of the syllabus for conformance with the master syllabus;

b. Evaluation of instructional delivery, including an evaluation of course rigor and appropriate grade distributions (taken in context of the course level and information provided in the Self Evaluation). This will include a review of student evaluations for items such as timeliness of feedback and appropriateness of interactions with students;

c. Evaluation of instructional assessment, including a review of syllabi and sample assessments;

d. Evaluation of non-teaching responsibilities to students, which may include advising or career mentoring loads, curriculum development, teaching for the good of the area, number of preps, acquisition of resources to assist in teaching, and other non-teaching information;

e. Evaluation from other sources deemed relevant and necessary to conduct a thorough evaluation, including information from sources, and related to criteria, listed in the matrix attached as Appendix A. This also includes the Area Coordinator assessment form included as Appendix D.

Tenured faculty who are not scheduled for a comprehensive evaluation will be evaluated using the comprehensive evaluation process under two conditions:

1. If quantitative student evaluation results suggest that there may have been a performance change requiring such review, as measured by their relative student evaluation scores falling below the mean of those faculty receiving an evaluation rating one level lower than their abbreviated evaluation rating. These faculty members must be notified of this requirement at least two weeks prior to the deadline for submission of their annual review materials.

2. If the faculty member chooses to submit materials for the comprehensive evaluation process in an attempt to increase the prior rating (meritorious to highly meritorious) or to receive more feedback from the committee.

All faculty members required to (or opting to) be reviewed under the comprehensive evaluation process will be evaluated based upon the crtieria below:

Rating Criteria
A faculty member will receive a rating as set forth in the criteria below.

Unsatisfactory: A faculty member will receive an evaluation of *unsatisfactory* if the faculty member fails to meet the criteria for satisfactory in two or more of the categories listed above and found in Appendix A. Note: failure to comply with the master syllabus for a course is a sufficient justification for an unsatisfactory rating without failure to meet any other criteria for satisfactory.

Satisfactory: A faculty member will receive an evaluation of *satisfactory* if the faculty member's overall performance is deemed adequate based on the criteria listed above and found in Appendix A. A satisfactory rating will be given if the faculty member meets the minimum college requirements for a successful course, including:

- A complete syllabus that aligns with the approved master syllabus for the course that outlines course logistics, course learning outcomes, assessment methods and grading scale, course outline, and course policies;

- Assessments that are considered appropriate to assess the student's progress on course learning outcomes;
- Reasonable currency in the course information and assessments;
- Course GPA distribution to indicate sufficient rigor (taking in to account explanations or information in the Self-Evaluation).
- Course evaluations that are free of thematic problems;
- Appropriate non-teaching responsibilities as outlined in the faculty member's SOE.

Meritorious: A faculty member will receive an evaluation of *meritorious* if the faculty member's overall performance is judged to significantly exceed the criteria for satisfactory. Consideration will be given to teaching overload classes to cover for emergency situations, indications of highly engaged or interactive courses, outstanding teaching evaluations, indications of innovative pedagogical techniques, and similar items.

Highly Meritorious: A faculty member will receive an evaluation of *highly meritorious* if the faculty member is judged to be among the highest of those faculty members rated as meritorious using the process established by the Business Division faculty to measure classroom performance, other aspects of teaching and non-teaching responsibilities to student and teaching support activities. Highly meritorious teachers typically will demonstrate outstanding performance in areas such as: outstanding student evaluations in the context of the courses that they teach; currency and innovation in their course delivery; exemplary performance while teaching multiple preps, new preps, or graduate courses; or the joining of research or practical experience to the educational objectives of the course.

As an indication of rigor, the FCB approved GPA guidelines are:

- o Maximum average GPA for 100 and 200-level course: 2.30
- o Maximum average GPA for 300-level course: 2.70
- o Maximum average GPA for 400-level course: 2.90

Faculty members whose GPAs fall significantly outside these guidelines may provide an explanation as part of the Student-related activities section of the Annual Review Self-Evaluation Form.

Scholarship/research/creative activities and/or Professional Development
Framework

1. The intellectual contributions matrix and the professional qualifications matrix (Appendix B and Appendix C attached to this document) will be used as a classification device for intellectual contributions and professional development. It should be reiterated that cell classifications in the matrices are illustrative and may be adjusted based on the quality of the item. Other classification tools may also be used as appropriate.

2. Evaluation of scholarly activity and professional development will be accomplished within a framework that includes consideration of each faculty member's SOE.

3. Evaluation of scholarly activity should include a consideration of "work in process" (i.e., working papers, recent submissions, revise and resubmits, etc.)

4. To foster faculty involvement in highest quality scholarly activity, evaluation shall include a moving-average window of scholarly and professional activity over a three-year period (the "review period") in determining a rating in these areas.

<div align="center">**Rating Criteria**</div>

A faculty member will receive a rating as set forth in the criteria below unless their SOE justifies a higher or lower rating.

Ratings for Scholarly Academics and Scholarly Practitioners

To rate the scholarly activity of Scholarly Academics and Scholarly Practitioners, the ARC will use a spreadsheet of Intellectual Contributions maintained by the Dean's office. This spreadsheet will include the number of publications in each Tier (see Appendix B). Prior to the evaluation period, each faculty member designated as a Scholarly Academic or Scholarly Practitioner will receive a notice from the Dean's office with a list of all publications for the review period, the tier of the publication, and the date when the faculty member's qualification will expire. Faculty members may work with the Dean's office prior to the deadline for submission of annual review materials to correct any errors in the list. For errors that are not corrected prior to the list, the faculty member may give an explanation to the ARC committee in the annual review materials. In addition to the list provided by the Dean's office, the ARC will consider "works in progress" that appear in the faculty member's workload form. Using the material in the workload form and the spreadsheet from the Dean's office, the ARC will rate the scholarly activity as follows:

Unsatisfactory: A faculty member will receive an evaluation of *unsatisfactory* if the faculty member was not academically qualified during the review period as determined by the Dean based upon the Academic Qualifications Criteria in place during the review period, unless reasonable progress was made toward qualification.

Satisfactory: A faculty member will receive an evaluation of *satisfactory* if the faculty member was academically qualified during the review period or if the faculty member made reasonable progress toward qualification but in either case does not meet the criteria for a rating of meritorious or higher as described below.

Meritorious: A faculty member will receive an evaluation of *meritorious* if the faculty member was qualified during the review period, and when there are sufficient intellectual contributions during the review period, including appropriate works in progress to indicate that the faculty member's qualification status will continue to be extended in the future. A faculty member generally will not receive a rating of meritorious if that faculty member was academically qualified based on prior year activities and had no intellectual contributions or works in progress during the review period.

Highly Meritorious: A faculty member will receive an evaluation of *highly meritorious* if the faculty member was qualified during the review period, and there were outstanding intellectual contributions (in terms of quantity and/or quality) during the review period. A rating of highly meritorious indicates that the faculty member is producing more intellectual contributions (at high levels of volume and/or quality as determined by the ARC) than are required to stay qualified. While the ARC will consider the full range of scholarship, it is incumbant upon the faculty member to highlight scholarly activity that would create eligibility for a rating of highly meritorious.

Current criteria for these rating levels can be found in Appendix B.

Ratings for Practice Academics and Instructional Practitioners

Unsatisfactory: A faculty member will receive an evaluation of *unsatisfactory* if the faculty member was not professionally qualified for their teaching level during the review period as determined by the Dean,

based upon the Professional Qualifications Criteria in place during the review period. See the table on pages _____ for Professional Qualifications criteria.

Satisfactory: A faculty member will receive an evaluation of *satisfactory* if the faculty member was professionally qualified during the review period, but does not meet the criteria for a rating of meritorious or higher as described below. A faculty member is considered professionally qualified if they meet the minimum number of points required for their teaching level. See the table on <mark>page __</mark> for minimum point qualifications.

Meritorious: A faculty member will receive an evaluation of *meritorious* if the faculty member was qualified during the review period and there are sufficient activities (e.g., continuing professional education, coursework, consulting or presentations) to demonstrate an ongoing commitment to professional development. A faculty member must earn 35 or more points using the professional qualifications matrix (see Appendix C below) over the previous three years or at least 24 points over the previous two years to receive a *meritorious* evaluation.

Highly Meritorious: A faculty member will receive an evaluation of *highly meritorious* if the faculty member was qualified during the review period and there are outstanding professional development activities during the review period. A rating of highly meritorious indicates that the faculty member is engaging in more relevant professional development activities (at high levels of volume and/or quality as determined by the ARC) than are required to stay qualified. A faculty member must earn 35 or more points using the professional qualifications matrix (see Appendix C below) over the previous two years to receive a *highly meritorous* evaluation.

Service activities

Framework

1. The faculty of the FCB strongly support the history and principles of shared governance. As such, faculty members agree, through the SOE, to engage in appropriate service activities. We acknowledge that benefits accrue to the FCB for faculty who serve the academic area, the college, the university, the community and their professional organizations.

2. Evaluation of service will be accomplished within a framework that includes consideration of each faculty member's SOE.

3. Evaluation of service should include a consideration of volume of service as well as quality of service. The ARC may request feedback from committee chairs, the Dean, committee members (in evaluation of a committee chair), and other relevant individuals for information on quality of service. Additional information may include amount of effort required of the committee, deadlines, etc.

4. Among other indicators, leadership in service is demonstrated through chairing committees; efforts related to recruitment of students; activity with or advising NAU student organizations; hosting or coordinating extra-curricular activities sanctioned by the College or University; holding office in professional organizations; chairing panels and committees for professional meetings; and organizing sessions at scholarly meetings and similar service to one's profession.

Rating Criteria

A faculty member will receive a rating as set forth in the criteria below unless their statement of expectation justifies a higher or lower rating.

Unsatisfactory: A faculty member will receive an evaluation of *unsatisfactory* if the faculty member fails to meet the criteria for satisfactory.

Satisfactory: For a *satisfactory* rating in the area of Service a faculty member shall demonstrate, through use of academic expertise and/or in a professional capacity, that the faculty member has performed the service as required by the faculty member's SOE. Appropriate activity may be demonstrated in one of the following spheres: the Academic Area, the FCB, NAU, the community, or in one's profession through activity beyond membership in professional organizations.

Meritorious: For a *meritorious* rating a faculty member must demonstrate appropriate service activity beyond that necessary for the *satisfactory* rating. This may include significant service in multiple service areas listed under the criteria for Satisfactory or more extensive activity in a single area. This may include leading a subcommittee or task force for a particular purpose or issue that arises during the evaluation period.

Highly Meritorious: For the *highly meritorious* rating a faculty member, in addition to appropriate service activity as necessary for *meritorious*, must additionally contribute substantial and sustained service that demonstrates outstanding leadership. Leadership activities may be evidenced in numerous ways but are the key requisite for consideration for *highly meritorious*. The ARC may request input from FCB or NAU administrators on the amount of work a committee took and the quality of performance by the faculty member in the leadership role.

Promotion, Tenure, Renewal and Merit Guidelines and Criteria for all FCB faculty members

The evaluation process for FCB faculty members seeking promotion, tenure, renewal, or merit within The W. A. Franke College of Business is carried out using the following criteria and guidelines. This process is meant to provide flexibility in the evaluation of faculty and permit some tradeoffs among areas where a faculty member may be able to demonstrate more capability in one area at the expense of another area. However, a candidate for promotion, tenure, or renewal should not expect a positive recommendation by simply meeting minimum criteria for each area to be evaluated. Note: A satisfactory or above rating on the faculty member's annual evaluation will not in and of itself ensure tenure.

The college's specific criteria indicate the levels of performance which need to be met in order for a faculty member to be *considered* for renewal, promotion, tenure, and/or merit from the college's perspective. Non-tenured faculty are cautioned to ensure their efforts are consistent with the major emphases placed on Student-related activities and Scholarship/research/creative activities and/or Professional Development by the FCB. See the "Guidelines on Allocation of Effort" on page ___ of this document. Criteria for these personnel actions are not the exclusive province of the college. Thus, achievement at or above the levels indicated by the College criteria is not a definitive indicator of subsequent positive actions.

In any situation where a faculty member is applying for promotion but has not been a faculty member in the FCB since his or her last promotion or for at least 6 years, the faculty member is responsible for demonstrating that all criteria are met for the promotion for at least 6 years. This may require a faculty member to provide teaching evaluations, research publications, and other evidence from prior institutions

(with explanations for interpretation if needed). It is the faculty member's responsibility to demonstrate that the criteria have been met for the minimum time period.

Any changes to the Promotion, Tenure, Renewal and Merit Guidelines and Criteria for all FCB faculty members must be approved by a majority of the appropriate voting faculty. The appropriate voting faculty are defined as follows:

        1) For changes to the sections titled, "Outside Letters for Promotion/Tenure Review," "Promotion" (subsection for Tenure-Track only), and "Tenure," only tenured and untenured tenure-track FCB faculty from both the Business Division and SHRM may vote.

        2) For any other changes to the Promotion, Tenure, Renewal and Merit Guidelines and Criteria for all FCB faculty members section, all tenured, untenured tenure-track faculty, and full-time non-tenure track FCB faculty from both the Business Division and SHRM may vote. One year instructors and part-time faculty are not eligible to vote.

Outside Letters for Promotion/Tenure Review

Outside letters attesting to the quality of a faculty member's scholarly activities are required in all applications for tenure and/or promotion for tenure-eligible faculty. The process for securing letters will be as follows:

1. Outside reviewers normally will be from institutions other than NAU. Letters from FCB colleagues are not considered "outside." Reviewers must hold the academic rank of the position for which the applicant is applying or higher. Reviewers may not be co-authors on any scholarly activity being evaluated for the promotion or tenure application or members of the candidates scholarly committees (for example thesis or dissertation committees).

2. The candidate will provide the P&T Committee with a list of three names of possible outside reviewers, including their title, address, phone number and other contact information. The candidate should have confirmed with each person his/her willingness to participate as a reviewer.

3. The candidate's Area Coordinator will provide the P&T Committee with a list of three names of possible outside reviewers, including their titles, addresses, phone numbers and other contact information. These persons are to be different from those submitted by the candidate. The Area Coordinator should confirm with each person his/her willingness to participate as a reviewer. It is the responsibility of the faculty member applying for tenure to contact the Area Coordinator when the applicant notifies the Dean's Office of their intention to apply for promotion and/or tenure in order to ensure that the Area Coordinator has sufficient time to collect appropriate names of possible reviewers.

4. The candidate will prepare for the P&T committee an electronic file of scholarly works representing the candidate's evidence of compliance with the requirements for scholarly activity for the promotion/tenure sought. If reviewers request a hard copy, the candidate will provide the P&T committee with a hard copy of that electronic file. The P&T Committee will request at least four outside letters for the candidate (two from the candidate's list and two from the Area's list) and will provide each reviewer with:

   a. A letter of request that includes instructions and guidelines for the review.

   b. Copy of FCB·NAU guidelines relative to scholarly activity required for the promotion/tenure sought.

   c. Electronic file of scholarly works (or a hard copy if requested by the reviewer).

5. The Dean's Assistant will provide staff support.

Promotion

This section relates to the promotion of all FCB faculty in tenure-track and non-tenure track lines. All faculty are expected to meet this criteria with the exception of current Assistant Professors seeking promotion to Associate Professor who will be evaluated based on the criteria in place when they were hired. Assistant Professors hired after this document is approved will be required to meet this criteria for promotion.

In order to be considered for any promotion or grant of tenure, a faculty member must demonstrate a collegial attitude while fulfilling all assigned responsibilities in meeting Area and College needs. This expectation of collegiality applies in all areas: Student-related activities, Scholarship/research/creative activities and/or Professional Development, Service activities, and Other activities. A collegial attitude may be demonstrated by a willingness to support and preserve a collegial atmosphere in the college and to support the mission and vision of the college. Collegiality includes how a faculty member treats and works with students and other faculty.

Tenure-Track Professor

The Conditions of Faculty Service document states:

> ***Promotion Review***
> ***Achievement of a faculty rank at NAU shall be determined by evaluation and recommendation using written ABOR and NAU criteria and college/academic unit criteria which must be approved by the Dean and Provost before implementation. Academic unit criteria may exceed ABOR (6-201 I.) and NAU standards.***
>
> ***In making promotion decisions, the entire record of the faculty member, including accomplishments at other institutions and other professional activity, shall be considered. (Sec. 1.4.6.1.3).***

Qualifications: To be hired as a tenure-track Assistant Professor, a faculty member genreally will hold a doctorate or other terminal degree or be ABD. In order to pursue promotion in a tenure track line, a faculty member must have completed a terminal degree in the appropriate field.

Promotion to Associate Professor

The NAU Conditions of Faculty Service document states:

The rank of associate professor is a tenure eligible or tenured position. A faculty member may not be promoted to associate professor unless concurrently standing for tenure, but a faculty member may be hired as a non-tenured associate professor. Normally, a faculty member becomes eligible to apply for the rank of associate professor in the sixth (6th) year of full-time service at the rank of assistant professor at NAU. Any prior service credit to be counted must be agreed to in writing at the time of hire.

To hold the rank of associate professor, the faculty member, at a minimum, must have:

> ***a. A record that shows substantial evidence of effectiveness in teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities.***

b. A record that shows a sustained pattern of scholarly activity or other creative endeavors related to the faculty member's discipline.

c. A record that shows a pattern of sustained service to the profession and the university community, and the potential to assume a leadership role within the faculty as one moves toward the rank of professor. (Sec 1.2.1)

The following represent minimum criteria within The W. A. Franke College of Business for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. These are minimum criteria that will qualify an individual for *consideration* for promotion. Faculty who do not meet these minimum criteria will not be considered for promotion. Thus these minimums are thresholds. The individual faculty member is expected to at least meet these criteria in order to be a successful candidate for promotion.

- At the level of promotion to Associate Professor the emphasis is primarily on the areas of Student-related activities and Scholarship/research/creative activities. A successful candidate must show substantial evidence of effectiveness in teaching and other student-related responsibilities as well as a sustained pattern of scholarly activity or other creative endeavors related to the faculty member's discipline.
- In addition, the faculty member must also show a pattern of sustained service to the profession and the University community along with the potential for future leadership. Please refer to the Guidelines for Evidence of Sustained Service on pages _____ for examples for each of these criteria.
- The FCB, in accordance with the Arizona Board of Regents, believes that successful candidates will be those who are committed and will continue to be committed to the goals and missions of the university and college.
- An earned doctorate or other terminal degree is also required by the college as a threshold condition for promotion to Associate Professor.

For each area, the university criteria from the Conditions of Faculty Service document are set forth in bold print below. These are followed by the minimum criteria for each area.

Student-related activities

The NAU Conditions of Faculty Service document states:

[T]he faculty member, at a minimum, must have . . .a record that shows substantial evidence of effectiveness in teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities. (Sec. 1.2.1).

The college minimum criteria for consideration for promotion to Associate Professor in the area of Student-related activities are:

1. The faculty member must show substantial evidence of effectiveness in the area of Student-related activities based on input taken from student, self, peer, and administrative reviews. These reviews include information from the Workload Form, numerical and written student comments, grade distribution data, peer faculty review of course syllabi, and exams and other course materials submitted by the faculty member for review.

2. Advising and/or Career Mentoring responsibilities commence with a faculty member's second contract. The faculty member must meet advising commitments and must be available to meet with advisees and/or career mentees.

Scholarship/research/creative activities

The Conditions of Faculty Service document states:

> *[T]he faculty member, at a minimum, must have . . .a record that shows a sustained pattern of scholarly activity or other creative endeavors related to the faculty member's discipline (Sec. 1.2.1).*

The college threshold criteria for consideration for promotion to Associate Professor in the relevant area of Scholarship/research/crative activities are:

A Business Division faculty member must publish a minimum of three articles in refereed journals by the time he or she submits materials for review for promotion. At least one of these must be published in a widely recognized high-quality journal in the discipline. Faculty members shall have an opportunity to petition the tiering of an intellectual contribution if the faculty member has information that an outlet has moved up in tier. No intellectual contribution will be tiered lower for the purposes of promotion and/or tenure regardless of a movement in the tier of the journal by the organizations that maintain the faculty-approved journal lists.

Faculty must also maintain an ongoing level of professional development appropriate to their discipline that assures they will remain current in their discipline and capable of delivering present and future curriculum that enables graduates to be up to date with current practices and be competitive in the job market. Professional development includes such activities as consulting; presenting or attending seminars, workshops, brown bags; participation in professional associations; and continuing education.

Service activities

The Conditions of Faculty Service document states:

> *[T]he faculty member, at a minimum, must have . . .a record that shows a pattern of sustained service to the profession and the university community, and the potential to assume a leadership role within the faculty as one moves toward the rank of professor (Sec. 1.2.1).*

The college threshold criteria for consideration for Promotion to Associate Professor in the area of Service activities are:

> Faculty must demonstrate effectiveness by providing significant services to the Area, College and/or the University community. Contributions include service on committees; participation in area, college, and university-wide activities, functions, and events; and service to the profession and professional service to the community.

Promotion to Professor

The NAU Conditions of Faculty Service document states (Sec. 1.2.1):

A faculty member must be tenured in order to be promoted to the rank of professor, unless at the time of initial appointment the Notice of Appointment indicates it is at the rank of professor without tenure. Professors are faculty who have achieved significant accomplishments in the areas of teaching and research. Normally, a faculty member becomes eligible to apply for the rank of professor in the sixth (6th) year of full-time service at the rank of associate professor at NAU (including any prior service credit agreed to at the time of hiring as associate).

To hold the rank of professor, the faculty member, at a minimum, must have:

> *a. A sustained pattern of high-quality teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities.*
>
> *b. A sustained pattern of high-quality scholarly or other creative endeavors related to the faculty member's discipline.*
>
> *c. A record that shows a mix of sustained service to the profession and the University community and evidence of leadership within the faculty member's department (e.g., demonstrated ability to assume leadership roles within the department, college, and/or the University at large, and to mentor junior faculty).*

In addition to providing evidence of effectiveness in all areas, faculty who apply for the rank of professor must demonstrate outstanding accomplishments in (a) or (b) above as defined by college and academic unit criteria.

The following represent minimum criteria and guidelines within The W. A. Franke College of Business for promotion to Professor. Guidelines differ significantly from minimum criteria. Guidelines are not thresholds; rather they provide a profile of a candidate who has demonstrated outstanding performance in meeting the goals and missions of the University and College. For promotion to Professor, success is more broadly defined: the individual faculty member must have a sustained pattern of high-quality teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities; a sustained pattern of high-quality scholarly or other creative endeavors in the faculty member's discipline; a record of sustained service to the profession and the university community; and evidence of leadership activity. In addition to providing effectiveness in all of the above, the faculty member must demonstrate outstanding performance in either Student-related activities or Scholarship/research/creative activities while complying with provisions of the Conditions of Faculty Service document. This approach allows flexibility for the individual and for the University and College in the pursuit of excellence and is in accordance with Arizona Board of Regents' policies as well as the goals and missions of the University and College.

Promotion to the rank of Professor requires that a faculty member, while in the rank of Associate Professor, meet minimum criteria in each of the three areas as set out below and demonstrate outstanding performance in Student-related activities or Scholarship/research/creative activities.

For each area, the university criteria from the Conditions of Faculty Service document are set forth in bold print below. These are followed by the minimum criteria, followed by the guidelines for achieving outstanding performance in each of the areas.

Student-related activities

The Conditions of Faculty Service document states:

> *[T]he faculty member, at a minimum, must have . . . a sustained pattern of high-quality teaching, advisement, and other student-related responsibilities (Sec. 1.2.1).*

The college threshold criteria for consideration for promotion to Professor in the area of Student-related activities are:

1. The faculty member must demonstrate a sustained pattern of high-quality activity in the area of Student-related activities based on input taken from student, self, peer, and administrative reviews.

These reviews include information from the Workload Form, numerical and written student comments, grade distribution data, peer faculty review of course syllabi, and exams.

2. Advising and/or Career Mentoring responsibilities commence with a faculty member's second contract. The faculty member must meet advising commitments and must be available to meet with advisees and/or career mentees.

Guidelines for Outstanding Performance

To be promoted to professor, a faculty member must demonstrate evidence of outstanding performance in either Student-related activities or Scholarship/research/creative activities. For a faculty member who selects Student-related activities as the area of outstanding performance, that faculty member must demonstrate leadership or exemplary performance in multiple endeavors that could include the following:

1. Obtaining high ratings on annual teaching evaluations.

2. Providing challenging academic experiences for students.

3. Serving as a faculty advisor for student organizations.

4. Course innovation.

5. Curricular development.

6. Coordinating with industry on curriculum, jobs for students and career directions.

7. Mentoring and preparing students for graduate school.

8. Other appropriate activities (case to be made by faculty member).

Scholarship/research/creative activities and/or Professional Development

The Conditions of Faculty Service document states:

> ***[T]he faculty member, at a minimum, must have . . .a sustained pattern of high-quality scholarly or other creative endeavors related to the faculty member's discipline (Sec. 1.2.1).***

The college threshold criteria for consideration for promotion to Professor in the area of Scholarship/research/creatice activities and/or Professional Development are:

> Faculty members must have published a minimum of three articles in refereed journals since the submission of materials for promotion to the associate professor rank. At least one of these should have been published in a widely recognized high-quality journal in the discipline. Faculty members shall have an opportunity to petition the tiering of an intellectual contribution if the faculty member has information that an outlet has moved up in tier. No intellectual contribution will be tiered lower for the purposes of promotion and/or tenure regardless of a movement in the tier of the journal by the organizations that maintin the faculty-approved journal lists.

> Faculty must maintain an ongoing level of professional development appropriate to their discipline that assures they will remain current in their discipline and capable of delivering present and future curriculum that enables graduates to be up to date with current practices and be competitive in the job market. Professional development includes consulting; presenting or attending seminars, workshops, brown bags; participation in professional associations; and continuing education.

Guidelines for Outstanding Performance

To be promoted to professor, a faculty member must demonstrate evidence of outstanding performance in either Student-related activities or Scholarship/research/creative activities. For a faculty member who

selects Scholarship/research/creative activities and/or Professional Development as the area of outstanding performance, that faculty member must demonstrate leadership or exemplary performance in the following types of endeavors:

1. Establishes a pattern of publication that substantially exceeds the minimum criteria. This activity can be demonstrated by publishing in various professional or other public and pedagogical journals, trade and textbooks, producing instructional materials such as written cases, monographs, instructional software, and other creative activities.

2. Leadership in scholarly activity can be evidenced by working across disciplines, working with junior faculty members, applying for and receiving funds from external agencies, and similar activities resulting in written scholarly output.

3. Other activities (case to be made by faculty member).

Service activities

Guidelines for Evidence of Sustained Service

The Conditions of Faculty Service document states:

> *[T]he faculty member, at a minimum, must have . . .a record that shows a mix of sustained service to the profession and the University community and evidence of leadership within the faculty member's department (e.g., demonstrated ability to assume leadership roles within the department, college, and/or the University at large, and to mentor junior faculty) (Sec. 1.2.1).*

Evidence of Sustained Service requires active and significant service in Area, College, and/or University committees. In addition, it is expected that a faculty member establishes leadership or exemplary activity in the following types of endeavors:

1. Chairing of committees, efforts related to recruitment of students, and participation in extra-curricular activities sanctioned by the college.

2. Service on institutional or ad hoc committees. This evidence should be documented and will likely vary based upon each faculty member's areas of interest and opportunity.

3. Participation in activities expected of college faculty including off-campus recruiting of students, contributing to Area initiatives to build and maintain contacts with business leaders, and participation in Area, College and University-wide functions and events.

4. Serving in leadership roles in the profession such as serving on regional, national, or international organization executive boards, journal editorial boards, or reviewing papers for journals.

5. A long-standing record of professional service to the community consistent with the missions of the University and the College.

6. Other activities (case to be made by the faculty member).

Lecturer

The NAU Conditions of Faculty Service document states (Sec 1.2.2):

> *Lecturers are non-tenured, non-tenure eligible faculty. A lecturer faculty member is appointed to one of the following academic ranks: lecturer, senior lecturer, or principal lecturer.*

Qualifications: *Lecturer ranks require an earned master's degree in the appropriate discipline.*

To be eligible for the rank of lecturer, the faculty member must demonstrate effectiveness in teaching, advising, and student-related responsibilities or, in the case of a new appointment, show promise of effectiveness if the candidate has no prior teaching experience.

The primary responsibility of this rank is teaching.

Promotion to Senior Lecturer

The NAU Conditions of Faculty Service document states (Sec. 1.2.2):

To be eligible for the rank of Senior Lecturer, the faculty member must have at least the following:

1. *A record of substantial and continued effectiveness in teaching and other student-related responsibilities;*

2. *A record of service and professional development related to the teaching role;*

3. *The equivalent of six years (12 semesters) of college-level teaching or other relevant professional experience. (Sec. 1.2.2)*

The college threshold criteria for consideration for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer are comparable to *those* anticipated for *promotion to the* associate *professor* rank; however, there is typically not a research requirement involved for the Senior Lecturer. Promotion is usually based upon Student-related activities, Professional Development related to the teaching role, and Service activities; however, other significant activity viewed as valuable to the college could be included. These activities may involve traditional or alternative forms of scholarly activity, activity supporting the college's outreach programs in applied research and professional development, and/or contributions to the implementation of new technology in the college and the classroom. Due to the significant emphasis that the Statements of Expectations for Lecturers place on Student-related activities, it is expected that a candidate for promotion to Senior Lecturer will demonstrate a sustained pattern of high-quality activity in the area of Student-related activities based on input taken from student, self, peer, and administrative reviews. These reviews include information from the Workload Form, numerical and written student comments, grade distribution data, peer faculty review of course syllabi, and exams.

A senior lecturer may not apply for promotion to a tenure-eligible rank but may apply for an open tenure-eligible position. To be promoted to Senior Lecturer, the college requires 6 years in the position of Lecturer. For a faculty member to be hired as a Senior Lecturer, the college requires at least 6 years of professional experience, at least 6 years of college-level teaching (at least 100 credit hours), or a combination of teaching and professional experience over 6 years with enough teaching experience to justify employment at this level.

Promotion to Principal Lecturer

The NAU Conditions of Faculty Service document states:

To be eligible for the rank of principal lecturer, the faculty member must have at least the following:

1. *A record of sustained excellence at the senior lecturer rank in teaching and other student-related responsibilities.*

2. *A record of sustained excellence in service and professional development related to the teaching role.*

3. *The equivalent of six years (12 semesters) of college-level teaching at the rank of senior lecturer or other relevant professional experience. (Sec. 1.2.2)*

To be promoted to Principal Lecturer, the college requires 6 years in the position of Senior Lecturer. For a faculty member to be hired as a Senior Lecturer, the college requires at least 12 years of professional experience with enough teaching experience to justify employment at this level, at least 12 years of college-level teaching (at least 200 credit hours), or a combination of teaching and professional experience over 12 years with enough teaching experience to justify employment at this level.

The College criteria for consideration for promotion to the rank of principal lecturer are generally comparable to those anticipated for promotion to the rank of professor; however, there is typically not a research requirement involved for the promotion to principal lecturer. Promotion is normally based upon performance in Student-related activities, Professional Development related to the teaching role, and Service activities. Promotion to the rank of principal lecturer requires that a faculty member, while in the rank of senior lecturer, demonstrate a sustained pattern of high-quality activity in the area of Student-related activities based on input taken from student, self, peer, and administrative reviews. These reviews include information from the Workload Form, numerical and written student comments, grade distribution data, peer faculty review of course syllabi, and exams. An earned doctorate is not required for this promotion.

The threshold criteria and guidelines for outstanding performance for Student-related activities and for Service activities defined under the criteria for promotion to professor also apply for promotion to principal lecturer. Threshold criteria and guidelines for excellence in the area of professional development are as follows:

Threshold criteria: faculty must maintain an ongoing level of professional development, appropriate to their discipline, that assures they will remain current in their discipline and capable of delivering present and future curriculum that enables graduates to be up to date with current practices and be competitive in the job market. Professional development includes discipline-specific consulting; presenting or attending seminars, workshops, brown bags; participation in professional associations; and continuing education.

Guidelines for excellence: Evidence of excellence for this promotion is shown when a faculty member establishes leadership or exemplary performance in endeavors such as:

1. Publication of scholarly activity;
2. Significant activity supporting the college's outreach programs in applied research and professional development;
3. Making substantial contributions to the implementation of new technology in the college and the classroom.
4. Obtaining high ratings on annual teaching evaluations.
5. Providing challenging academic experiences for students.
6. Serving as a faculty advisor for student organizations.
7. Course innovation.
8. Curricular development.
9. Coordinating with industry on curriculum, jobs for students and career directions.

10. Mentoring and preparing students for graduate school.
11. Other appropriate activities (case to be made by faculty member).

Professor of Practice

The <u>NAU Conditions of Faculty Service</u> states (Sec 1.2.2):

> *Professors of practice are non-tenured, non-tenure eligible faculty. A professor of practice is appointed to one of the following academic ranks: assistant professor of practice, associate professor of practice, or professor of practice.*
>
> *Qualifications: Professors of practice are faculty members who have established themselves by expertise, achievements, and reputation over a sustained period of time to be distinguished professionals in an area of practice or discipline but who may not have the terminal degree in the discipline.*
>
> *To be eligible for the rank of assistant professor of practice, the faculty member must demonstrate effectiveness in teaching and other student-related responsiblities or show promise of such effectiveness if the candidate has no prior teaching experience.*

Generally to be hired as an Assistant Professor of Practice, a faculty member will have completed a graduate degree or have significant work experience that would justify not having a graduate degree. A faculty member may be hired as an Assistant Professor of Practice with years of credit toward promotion if that faculty member has sufficient professional experience and teaching experience to justify those years of credit.

Promotion to Associate Professor of Practice

The <u>Conditions of Faculty Service</u> states:

> *To be eligible for the rank of associate professor of practice, the faculty member must:*
>
> 1. *Meet the criteria for assistant professor of practice;*
>
> 2. *Supply evidence of substantial scholarly, creative, or professional achievements. (Sec 1.2.2)*

To be promoted to Associate Professor of Practice, the college requires 6 years in the position of Assistant Professor of Practice. For a faculty member to be hired as an Associate Professor of Practice, the college requires at least 6 years of professional experience, at least 6 years of college-level teaching (at least 100 credit hours) , or a combination of teaching and professional experience over 6 years with enough teaching experience to justify employment at this level.

The college threshold criteria for consideration of promotion to Associate Professor of Practice in the area of Student-related activities are:

1. The faculty member must demonstrate a sustained pattern of high-quality activity in the area of Student-related activities based on input taken from student, self, peer, and administrative reviews. These reviews include information from the Workload Form, numerical and written student comments, grade distribution data, peer faculty review of course syllabi, and exams.

Promotion to Professor of Practice

The NAU Conditions of Faculty Service states:

> *To be eligible for the rank of professor of practice, the faculty member must comply with at least the following:*
>
> *1. Meet the criteria for associate professor of practice;*
>
> *2. Supply evidence of substantial scholarly, creative, or professional achievements. (Sec 1.2.2)*

To be promoted to Professor of Practice, the college requires 6 years in the position of Associate Professor of Practice. For a faculty member to be hired as a Professor of Practice, the college requires at least 12 years of professional experience, at least 6 years of college-level teaching (at least 200 credit hours), or a combination of teaching and professional experience over 12 years with enough teaching experience to justify employment at this level.

The college threshold criteria for consideration of promotion to Professor of Practice in the area of Student-related activities are:

1. The faculty member must demonstrate sustained excellence in the area of Student-related activities based on input taken from student, self, peer, and administrative reviews. These reviews include information from the Workload Form, numerical and written student comments, grade distribution data, peer faculty review of course syllabi, and exams

Additionally, the college threshold criteria for consideration of promotion to Professor of Practice in the area of Scholarly Activity/Professional Development are:

1. Faculty must maintain an ongoing level of professional development or scholarly activity appropriate to their discipline that assures they will remain current in the discipline and capable of delivering present and future curriculum that enables graduates to be up to date on current practices. Professional development includes consulting, presenting or attending seminars, workshops, brown bags; participation in professional associations; and continuing education.

Guidelines for Outstanding Performance: Outstanding Performance for this promotion may be shown when a faculty member establishes leadership of exemplary performance in endeavors such as:

1. Publication of scholarly activity;

2. Significant activity supporting the college's outreach programs in applied research and professional development;

3. Making substantial contributions to the implementation of new technology in the college and the classroom.
4. Obtaining high ratings on annual teaching evaluations.
5. Providing challenging academic experiences for students.
6. Serving as a faculty advisor for student organizations.
7. Course innovation.
8. Curricular development.
9. Coordinating with industry on curriculum, jobs for students and career directions.
10. Mentoring and preparing students for graduate school.
11. Other appropriate activities (case to be made by faculty member).

Tenure

The NAU Conditions of Faculty Service document states:

> ***To be eligible for tenure the faculty member must normally comply with the criteria for Associate Professor and, in addition, must show promise of continued productivity in all areas. The potential for long-term productivity of the faculty member to the university must be considered in making the tenure decision. Tenure is typically offered only to those faculty serving full-time in a tenure-eligible position. (Sec 1.4.6.1.4)***

The college threshold criteria for promotion to associate professor listed on pages _____ of this document serve as the criteria for tenure consideration together with the prospect of continued productivity in the relevant areas (Student-related activities, Scholarship/research/creative activities, Service activities, and Other activities.)

College threshold criteria for tenure consideration in the areas of Student-related activities, Scholarship/research/creative activities, and Service activities for these faculty are as follows:

Student-related activities

In the area of Student-related activities, the faculty member, while at NAU, must meet each of the threshold criteria for promotion to associate professor stated previously in this document. In order to demonstrate that the criteria are met, faculty must provide evidence of quality teaching for a minimum of 6 years (including materials with explanations if needed from prior institutions).

Scholarship/research/creative activities

In the area of Scholarship/research/creative activities, a faculty member must have published or have received acceptances of publication for a minimum of three articles in refereed journals by the time he or she submits materials for review for promotion. At least one of these must be published in a widely recognized high-quality journal in the discipline while at NAU. Faculty must also, while at NAU, maintain an ongoing level of professional development appropriate to their discipline that assures they will remain current in their discipline and capable of delivering present and future curriculum that enables graduates to be up to date with current practices and be competitive in the job market. Professional development includes consulting; presenting or attending seminars, workshops, brown bags; and participation in professional associations and continuing education.

Service activities

In the area of Service activities, the faculty member must, while at NAU, meet each of the threshold criteria for promotion to associate professor stated previously in this document.

Retention and/or Renewal

For tenure-eligible faculty, The NAU Conditions of Faculty Service document states:

> ***A faculty member whose appointment is tenure eligible shall have no legal right of continued employment or expectation of retention beyond the current contract period. Retention will be based on the review and evaluation procedure described below and on the approved ABOR, NAU, and unit/college criteria. In addition, retention shall consider the needs of the university/college/school/department. For the purposes of Probationary Review, "first" and "second" year for tenure eligible faculty shall be determined by years of service at NAU regardless of years of prior service agreed to at the time of hire. (Sec 1.4.6.1.2)***

For non-tenure-eligible faculty, The NAU Conditions of Faculty Service document states:

> *A faculty member whose appointment is non-tenure eligible shall have no legal right of continued employment or expectation of renewal in that appointment beyond the current contract period. Renewal of appointment will be based on the review and evaluation process described below in consideration of approved ABOR, NAU, and unit/college criteria for non-tenure eligible faculty. In addition, renewals shall consider the needs of the university/college/school/ department and funding availability. (Sec 1.4.6.2.2)*

Generally speaking, a tenure-eligible faculty member will receive a recommendation for retention if reasonable progress is being made toward tenure. A non tenure-eligible faculty member will be "eligible for renewal" if the conditions of the faculty member's statement of expectations document are met. In both instances the decision is subject to budgetary constraints, performance and program needs. The Annual Review Committee is charged with the review and recommendation for renewal or retention.

Merit

The distribution of merit is set by the University in conjunction with criteria established by the Arizona Board of Regents and/or the State legislature.

The Conditions of Faculty Service document states:

> *The basis for merit raises, including those for first-year faculty, shall be the Annual Review. The Dean will provide to the Provost a list of faculty members who are to receive merit raises.*
>
> *The Provost shall approve the plan for distribution of merit raises with input from the Faculty Senate. Should merit funding not be available annually, evaluation for the subsequent merit increase will be based on the three immmediately preceding years, or on the period since the previous merit distributions, whichever is shorter.*
>
> *If the faculty member is dissatisfied with the merit decision of the Dean, the faculty member may submit an appeal with appropriate documentation to the Provost. The Provost will review the appeal and supporting documentation. The decision of the Provost is final. (Sec 1.4.6.2.1)*

Merit should be based on activities completed in all areas in which faculty are evaluated. Lecturers, senior lecturers, assistant and associate professors of practice, and assistant and associate professors must be making significant progress toward the next highest rank. Full professors and principal lecturers must be making significant contributions in the areas in which they are evaluated. Recommendations for merit pay will be based on the faculty performance evaluations which are to be conducted annually by the Promotion & Tenure Committee and the college dean based on the criteria established herein. More information on merit can be found on page ___.

Academic & Professional Qualifications for Business Division Faculty

Qualifications Criteria

The purposes of the qualifications criteria are to assure faculty are appropriately qualified at the time they are hired and that they maintain the currency of their knowledge by active involvement in their teaching field. Criteria are defined for initial hires in both tenure-track and non-tenure-track positionsas well as for ongoing faculty to demonstrate that they remain current in their teaching field. Any changes to the

Academic & Professional Qualifications for Business Division Faculty must be approved by a majority of the Business Division Faculty. All tenured, tenure-track, and full-time non-tenure track faculty may vote in an election related to the changes to this section. One-year instructors and part-time faculty are not eligible to vote on changes to this section.

Faculty Qualifications

The qualification standards set forth herein are not intended to be evaluation criteria for promotion, merit, tenure, or post-tenure review. These qualification standards are designed as a tool for assessment for The W. A. Franke College of Business to assure that FCB faculty are qualified to teach the courses they are assigned to teach and that the faculty remain current in the field of teaching. In addition, the assessment of faculty will assist the faculty to design their development plans based on perceived needs to remain qualified. According to AACSB Standard 15, there are four categories of qualified faculty: Scholarly Academics, Practice Academics, Scholarly Practitioners, and Instructional Practitioners. Each status has different expectations for initial qualification and continuing qualification. Faculty members in the FCB normally are expected to be qualified under one of the four AACSB categories. To determine qualification, the following guidelines apply:

Normal Hiring Guidelines

1. Faculty hired in to the FCB must meet the criteria to teach courses as set forth by the Faculty Senate policy entitled, "Required Qualifications for Instructional Faculty" as approved November 7, 2016.

2. Faculty hired into tenure-track positions normally are initially qualified as Scholarly Academic as further defined below.

3. Faculty hired into all non-tenure-track positions normally are initially qualified as Scholarly Academic, Practice Academic, Scholarly Practitioner, or Instructional Practitioner as further defined below. Individuals not meeting any of the four qualification categories described above (considered Other by AACSB) may be hired in to non-tenure-track positions under exceptional circumstances or as part-time faculty but only if they can provide strong evidence of professional development activity or experience in the field in which they will teach.

Initial Qualification

Upon hiring, faculty members are given an initial qualification status. For the purpose of initial qualification:

1. Scholarly Academics normally possess a doctoral degree or are ABD in the field in which they are hired to teach. Faculty with a doctorate in a different field may be considered qualified only if they can provide strong evidence of professional development activity or experience in the field in which they will teach. If a faculty member received the doctoral degree more than five years prior to hiring, to be initially qualified as a Scholarly Academic, the faculty member must have a recent history of publications. While there is no minimum number of publications, the faculty member must have sufficient activity in the prior four years to meet the continuing qualification standards for Scholarly Academics as described below.

2. Practice Academics normally possess a doctoral degree or are ABD in the field in which they are hired to teach. Typically the degree (or last coursework for ABD faculty) is more than five years old. Practice Academics may have a history of research and publication but may have maintained

currency during recent years by using their degree in practice as a consultant or in other forms of professional engagement. This engagement generally is based on prior scholarly activity. Practice Academics are current in their field through professional development or work experience.

3. Scholarly Practitioners normally possess a masters degree in a field related to their teaching assignment and a recent history of research and academic publication. Scholarly Practitioners must have sufficient scholarly activity during the prior four years to meet the continuing qualification standards or Scholarly Practitioners as described below. Scholarly Practitioners may be hired without a master's degree if the depth, duration, sophistication, and complexity of their professional experience compensates for the lack of a master's degree.

4. Instructional Practitioners normally possess a masters degree in a field related to their teaching assignment and have significant professional experience related to their area of teaching assignment. Alternatively, Instructional Practitioners may hold a professional certification or have demonstrated professional experience significant in duration and level of responsibility current at the time of hiring. Instructional Practitioners may be hired without a master's degree if the depth, duration, sophistication, and complexity of their professional experience compensates for the lack of a master's degree.

Continuing Qualification

Faculty members are expected to maintain qualification. Faculty members may move from one status to another status but should do so only after consultation with the Dean. Any change in status should be planned and declared in an SOE as the college is required by the AACSB to maintain certain percentages within the qualification categories.

In order to remain qualified, faculty members must show evidence of faculty development, intellectual contributions, or current professional experience relevant to their teaching field during the most recent four year period of time. The minimum requirements of faculty to assure their continued qualification are set forth below. Meeting these minimum requirements will not assure a faculty member promotion, tenure, or merit. Those determinations are made under applicable College and University promotion, tenure, and merit criteria and procedures .

Minimum Requirements to Demonstrate Currency in Teaching

A faculty member must meet the following standards over the most recent four-year period depending on their qualification status:

1. Scholarly Academics (Based on the Matrix of Intellectual Contributions, Appendix B) must maintain currency through research and publication in the field of teaching. They must publish at least:

    a. One item from Tier 1, or

    b. Two items from Tier 2a, or

    c. One item from Tier 2a and two or more from Tier 2B or Tier 3, or

    d. Two items from Tier 2b and one or more items from Tier 3

2. Scholarly Practitioners (Based on the Matrix of Intellectual Contributions, Appendix B) must maintain currency through research and publication in the field of teaching. At a minimum, they must publish at least:

a. One item from Tier 2a or higher, or
b. Two items from Tier 2b, or
c. One item from Tier 2b and two or more items from Tier 3

3. Practice Academics (Based on the attached Professional Qualifications Matrix, Appendix C) must maintain currency through a sustained and focused pattern of professional experiences related to the faculty member's prior scholarship and/or professional field.. Activities are tracked using the Professional Qualifications Matrix which describes the list of activities that a faculty member may pursue in order to maintain currency. These activities fall under the following general categories but are not limited to:

   o Ongoing continuing professional education to maintain the ability to practice their profession (e.g. CPA, CFA, bar affiliation).

   o Consulting or continued work in a relevant field related to teaching responsibilities.

   o Current board member of a large for profit or not-for-profit organization

   o Participation in activities affiliated with education seminars/workshops

   o Publishing articles, books and newsletters

4. Instructional Practitioners (Based on the attached Professional Qualifications Matrix, Appendix C) must maintain currency through a sustained and focused pattern of development activities or professional experiences related to the faculty member's teaching responsibilities. Activities are tracked using the Professional Qualifications Matrix which describes the list of activities that a faculty member may pursue in order to maintain currency. These activities fall under the following general categories but are not limited to:

   o Ongoing continuing professional education to maintain the ability to practice their profession (eg CPA, CFA, bar affiliation)

   o Graduate level coursework

   o Consulting or continued work in a relevant field related to teaching responsibilities.

   o Current board member of a large for profit or not-for-profit organization

   o Participation in activities affiliated with education seminars/workshops

   o Publishing articles, books and newsletters

For both Practice Academics and Instructional Practitioners, each activity is assigned a fixed number of points in the professional qualifications matrix (see Appendix C below). In order to retain professional qualification, a faculty member must earn a minimum number of points over a four-year window. A faculty member is qualified for successively higher level tiers of teaching based upon the following structure:

Level of Teaching	Minimum Number of Points Needed Over a Four Year Window
100 – 200 course level	20
300 – 400 course level	30
Graduate course level	40

Participating or Supporting Status

In addition to qualification issues, AACSB standard 5 requires faculty to be classified as Participating or Supporting. Per standard 5, a Participating faculty member "actively and deeply engages in the activities of the school in matters beyond direct teaching responsibilities. Such matters might include policy decisions, advising, research, and service commitments. The faculty member may participate in the governance of the school and be eligible to serve as a member on appropriate committees responsible for academic policymaking and/or other decisions. The individual may participate in a variety of non-class activities such as directing an extracurricular activity, providing academic and career advising, and representing the school on institutional committees." Supporting faculty members generally do not share in these functions. At the FCB, full-time Instructors, full-time Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, Principal Lecturers, Professors of Practice (at any rank), Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Full Professors are considered Participating Faculty. Full-time staff members who teach part-time also are considered Participating. Part-time faculty are considered Supporting Faculty.

Post-Tenure Review Process for all FCB Faculty

The goals and principles of the Post-Tenure Review Process, as implemented in 1997 by the Arizona Board of Regents, are established at Northern Arizona University to ensure sustained high quality faculty performance, especially in the areas of teaching and other student-related responsibilities and specifically as faculty move well beyond the point of receiving a tenured appointment. The post-tenure review process emphasizes opportunities for continued faculty development and provides additional accountability to the University community, to the public, and to the Board.

The post-tenure review process has been linked to the annual performance review process, which is used to help determine whether an individual may need assistance in maintaining a performance level that is deemed at least satisfactory by peers. According to ABOR policies 6-201 and 6-211, an annual performance evaluation of an individual must be conducted by his/her peers, and by the Dean. If an individual who has already achieved tenure at any rank (assistant, associate, or professor) is judged to be performing at less than a satisfactory level as defined below, then a faculty improvement process is developed to assist that individual.

Any changes to the Post-Tenure Review Process for all FCB Faculty must be approved by a majority of the FCB Faculty, including the Business Division and SHRM. All tenured, tenure-track, and full-time non-tenure track faculty may vote in an election related to the changes to this section. One-year instructors and part-time faculty are not eligible to vote on changes to this section.

Relation of Annual Review Process to Post-Tenure Review Process

(adapted from NAU COFS Section 1.4.7.1)

1. The purpose of annual performance evaluations is to provide systematic assessments of faculty accomplishments and to encourage outstanding performance through a system of rewards that are based on the evaluation. At a minimum, the evaluation should determine whether faculty are performing their duties at a satisfactory level while ideally at the same time identifying a profile of accomplishments that are well above average and setting the standard for others to emulate. Finally,

those who are not performing at a satisfactory level must be identified. Thus, a faculty member may be rated at one of the following four levels: unsatisfactory, satisfactory, meritorious, or highly meritorious.

2. The Post-Tenure Review Process begins with the Annual Review for each tenured faculty member. If a tenured faculty member receives an unsatisfactory performance rating overall or in a single evaluation category (Student-related activities, Scholarship/research/creative activities and/or Professional Development, or Service activities) for a single year, then the Annual Reviews and supporting documentation for the past thirty-six (36) months will be examined carefully.

3. The rating of unsatisfactory means that there is demonstrated substantial failure to perform properly-assigned duties as set forth in the faculty member's Statement of Expectations. The burden of proof for an unsatisfactory rating rests with the evaluating committee and/or administrators, who must agree upon and provide the faculty member with a written statement specifying the basis upon which this rating was determined and the nature of the remedial action being recommended.

4. Northern Arizona University recognizes that extenuating circumstances (illness, accident, personal tragedy, etc.) may affect one's performance in such a way that leads to an unsatisfactory evaluation outcome. However, within the spirit of the principle governing this process, it is up to the academic unit peer faculty and administrators (Chair, Associate Dean, and Dean) to work with the individual to determine an appropriate course of action to address the concern over the individual's performance. If an unsatisfactory rating in an individual area is due to extenuating circumstances which have passed or been overcome, then remedial action may not be necessary.

5. As a result of an annual performance evaluation, if a faculty member receives an unsatisfactory evaluation and the faculty member chooses not to contest the evaluation or if the unsatisfactory evaluation is upheld through the administrative review process, the following actions apply:

   a. The first rating of unsatisfactory in any single area must be addressed by the Chair, Associate Dean, or Dean. Depending on the specifics and sources of the problem the Chair, Associate Dean, or Dean may work with the faculty member on an individual basis to isolate the sources of difficulty and to develop a plan to ameliorate them; or, if the Chair, Associate Dean, or Dean deems it necessary or the faculty member requests it, create a formal Faculty Development Plan described in section 1.4.7.2.a, *Faculty Development Plan*.

   b. A faculty member must enter a unit level Performance Improvement Plan as described in section 1.4.7.2.b *Performance Improvement Plan* whenever:

      1) The faculty member receives an unsatisfactory evaluation for overall performance that is not due to extenuating circumstances that have already been overcome,

      2) The faculty member receives two unsatisfactory evaluations in the same or different areas of assigned responsibility within a thirty-six (36) month period and is not participating in a Faculty Development Plan, or

      3) The faculty member does not complete a Faculty Development Plan successfully.

Faculty Improvement Process

(from NAU COFS Section 1.4.7.2)

This section describes the Faculty Development Plan and the Performance Improvement Plan for improving upon unsatisfactory evaluations.

Faculty Development Plan

The purpose of the Faculty Development Plan is to identify strategies and resources to assist the faculty member in achieving a performance level of satisfactory or higher. The plan will set forth specific benchmarks to be achieved by the faculty member during the plan period, which is normally twelve (12) months.

1. Initiating the Faculty Development Plan:

   a. The Faculty Development Plan is to be initiated within twenty-one (21) days from final notification of the unsatisfactory rating following the outcome of any challenges to the rating.

   b. The faculty member and the Chair/Associate Dean/Dean will create a Faculty Development Plan through a consultative process involving the faculty member, the Chair/Associate Dean/Dean and the Faculty Status Committee or Promotion and Tenure Committee as determined by the academic unit structure. If the faculty member and the Chair/Associate Dean/Dean cannot reach agreement then the faculty member may choose to challenge the proposed plan to the next administrative level, up to the level of Provost. The decision of the Provost is final.

   c. The Faculty Development Plan becomes a part of the Statement of Expectations for the faculty member.

   d. Under no circumstances will the development and implementation of a plan occur later than the semester following the unsatisfactory evaluation.

2. Strategies and Resources for Faculty Development Plans

   Appropriate strategies and resources for Faculty Development Plans may include, but are not limited to, the following:

   a. Reassigning the faculty member's allocation of effort (e.g., changing teaching assignments and/or schedules in ways that will enhance the faculty member's performance), as set forth in the annual Statement of Expectations, in ways that will best utilize the faculty member's education and talents as well as maximize the faculty member's contributions to the university.

   b. Providing the faculty member with support for faculty development to improve performance in the area of difficulty.

   c. Enabling the faculty member to obtain reasonable assistance in dealing with barriers that may be interfering with effective performance.

3. Successful Faculty Development Plans

   Upon completion of the Faculty Development Plan, if the faculty member's performance is satisfactory in all areas, the faculty member returns to the regular performance evaluation process.

4. Unsuccessful Faculty Development Plans

   a. If a faculty member participating in a Faculty Development Plan fails to achieve a level of performance that is satisfactory or higher within a 12-month period, the faculty member must enter a Performance Improvement Plan as set forth in ABOR, *Common Elements of the Post-Tenure Review Process*, Item 5. (See NAU Conditons of Faulty Service document,Appendix D available on-line at www.nau.edu/Provost/Resources-Policies.)

   b. The faculty member's performance while in the Faculty Development Plan must be found unsatisfactory by both the Administrator and the Faculty Status Committee or Promotion and Tenure Committee, and any challenges to the evaluation must have been exhausted before the faculty member is required to enter into a Performance Improvement Plan.

Performance Improvement Plan

The purpose of the Performance Improvement Plan is to provide a final opportunity for the faculty member to achieve a level of performance that is satisfactory or higher. The plan will set forth specific benchmarks to be accomplished by the faculty member. As provided in Item 2 of the *Common Elements of the Post-Tenure Review Process (Appendix D)*, developed by the Arizona Faculties Council in 1996-97, the Performance Improvement Plan is required if a faculty member is evaluated as overall unsatisfactory, or receives two unsatisfactory ratings within a thirty-six (36) month period in the same or different evaluation area(s) during an Annual Performance Evaluation and is not participating in a Faculty Development Plan, or if a faculty member fails to achieve a level of performance of satisfactory or higher under a faculty development plan within a twelve (12) month period.

If a faculty member chooses not to enter into a Performance Improvement Plan, the appropriate administrator may begin the process for dismissal for just cause.

The following sections define the process for establishing the Performance Improvement Plan.

1. Creating a Performance Improvement Mentoring Committee

   When a Performance Improvement Plan is required, a Performance Improvement Mentoring Committee consisting of at least two tenured faulty members will be established. One of the two tenured faculty members will be selected by the faculty member and the other(s) will be selected by the Dean in consultation with the Chair/Associate Dean/Dean.

   The Performance Improvement Mentoring Committee will be charged with advising the faculty member on strategies and progress related to successful completion of the Performance Improvement Plan. The committee may also be consulted in the creation of the Plan.

2. Creating the Performance Improvement Plan

   The Performance Improvement Plan, which will become part of the faculty member's Statement of Expectations, will be created as follows:

   a. The Performance Improvement Plan is to be initiated within twenty-one (21) days from final notification of the unsatisfactory rating following the outcome of any challenges to the rating.

   b. The faculty member will create a Performance Improvement Plan through a consultative process involving the faculty member, the Chair/Associate Dean/Dean, and the Faculty Status Committee or Promotion and Tenure Committee as determined by the academic unit structure. If the faculty member and the Chair/Associate Dean/Dean cannot reach agreement, then the faculty member may choose to challenge the proposed plan to the next administrative level, up to the level of Provost. The decision of the Provost is final.

   c. Under no circumstances will the development and implementation of a plan occur later than the semester following the unsatisfactory evaluation.

3. Strategies and Resources for Performance Improvement Plan

   Appropriate strategies and resources for the Performance Improvement Plan may include, but are not limited to the following:

   a. Reassigning the faculty member's allocation of effort (e.g., changing teaching assignments and/or schedules in ways that will enhance the faculty member's performance), as set forth in the annual Statement of Expectations, in ways that will best utilize the faculty member's education and talents as well as maximize the faculty member's contributions to the university.

   b. Providing the faculty member with support for faculty development to improve performance in the area(s) of difficulty.

c. Enabling the faculty member to obtain reasonable assistance in dealing with barriers that may be interfering with effective performance.

4. Mentoring the Completion of the Performance Improvement Plan

Once a Performance Improvement Plan has been created, progress against established benchmarks for the plan will be monitored by the Performance Improvement Mentoring Committee. At the completion of each benchmark, progress is reported to the Chair/Associate Dean/Dean. A faculty member participating in a Performance Improvement Plan may request a review of his/her updated Professional Review File by the Faculty Status Committee (Promotion and Tenure Committee in non-departmentalized units) at any time to determine if the faculty member has reached a level of performance better than unsatisfactory. At any time that a faculty member participating in a Performance Improvement Plan achieves a level of performance better than unsatisfactory, he/she will return to the regular Annual Review process.

5. Time Frame for Completion of the Performance Improvement Plan

Deficiencies generally will be addressed through a one-year Performance Improvement Plan. In rare circumstances, where the deficiency cannot be fully remedied in one year, the duration of the plan may be extended upon the recommendation of the unit Director or the Dean, with approval by the Provost.

6. Unsuccessful Performance Improvement Plan

At the end of the Performance Improvement Plan period, the Faculty Status Committee (Promotion and Tenure Committee for non-departmentalized units) will evaluate the faculty member's progress and level of performance against the plan. If the faculty member has not achieved a level of performance better than unsatisfactory, the committee will recommend dismissal in accordance with the procedures set forth in ABOR 6-201 and in Appendix D of the NAU Conditons of Faculty Service. This document is available as a link from this NAU website (www.nau.edu/provost/resourcespolicies).

If dismissal is recommended, the faculty member will continue to retain the rights to use the appeal process set forth in Appendix A of the Conditions of Faculty Service.

Accountability Mechanisms

(from NAU COFS Section 1.4.7.3)

The following information will be collected regularly and presented to the Arizona Board of Regents to document implementation of the post-tenure review process.

1. Tenure Audit

The tenure audit will include a count of the outcomes of annual reviews for tenured faculty, and the number of individuals entering into a post-tenure process. Status of individuals already engaged in a faculty improvement process will also be reported.

2. Dean's Level Audit Report

In addition to the Dean's normal participation in the annual review process each year, the Dean creates a committee consisting of the Dean and two tenured faculty within the college to conduct a yearly review of the performance ratings of 20% of the college's tenured faculty. Over a five year period, all files of tenured faculty within the college should have been reviewed.

The purpose of the audit is to determine the adequacy and fairness of the processes for faculty review within the units, and if appropriate, to refer the files back to the unit for discussion and resolution.

Feedback is to be provided to the appropriate Chair and peer review committees regarding the outcome of the process evaluation.

3. Academic Program Review

   Program reviews will occur every five (5) to seven (7) years, and will be conducted by the Chair, Dean and a panel of qualified members, which shall include external experts. The program review will include evidence about faculty contributions to the unit and University missions.

Sabbatical Leave Guidelines for all FCB Faculty

This guidance for FCB faculty supplements the policies covering faculty leaves in the NAU Conditions of Faculty Service. The objective is to provide a systematic and fair process for the application for, feedback about, and decisions on faculty leaves in The W.A. Franke College of Business. Any changes to the Sabbatical Leave Guidelines for all FCB Faculty must be approved by a majority of the FCB Faculty, including the Business Division and SHRM. All tenured, tenure-track, and full-time non-tenure track faculty may vote in an election related to the changes to this section. One-year instructors and part-time faculty are not eligible to vote on changes to this section.

1. The NAU policies for faculty wishing to apply for sabbatical leave (Sec. 1.7.1) or leave of absence without pay (Sec. 1.7.5) may be found in the NAU Conditions of Faculty Service. This document is available as a link from this NAU website (www.nau.edu/provost/resourcespolicies).

2. The objective at the FCB is to provide leaves for faculty development purposes when the sabbaticals support the College and University missions and when prudent use of resources allows. In particular, the Area and College programs must be maintained during the faculty member's absence without denying student access to courses needed for ordinary good progress or graduation and without causing undue stress upon area faculty (e.g., increased teaching loads).

3. The NAU calendar for notice and application for leaves should be used.

4. Notice of intent to apply letter should contain specific times, arrangements and outputs contemplated, preliminary discussions with area coordinator for coverage of courses, advising, and other duties.

5. At a minimum, applications must contain the following in order to be considered:

   a. Faculty Review Routing Form

   b. Current curriculum vita

   c. Pre-Application Request

   d. A detailed plan and timetable

      Explain in detail the nature of your sabbatical project. How would you estimate potential contributions to knowledge in your discipline or area, and its value to your ongoing development as a university faculty member? Analyze your personal and professional goals for the next five years. How do you view developments in your discipline and how do you propose to continue your professional contributions?

   e. List of courses taught for the last two years to include current year

   f. Documentation of advance arrangements

Provide an outline of the plan for your leave in the form of a timeline. Note major activities such as trips, attendance at meetings, courses to be taken, library visits, etc. and indicate where you will be during the timeline. State clearly where you plan to reside and work during the entire period of your sabbatical.

If you will remain on campus for extended periods of time, what arrangements will be made to ensure that you free yourself from the university (e.g., home office, library hours).

If proposed leave is not for an entire year, please provide a rationale that justifies the shorter leave in relationship to the proposal.

If you have received grant funding or if proposals have been submitted to help fund the leave, please describe.

    g. A letter from the Area Coordinator/Chair/Associate Dean indicating how classes will be maintained and offered during the proposed sabbatical.

    h. Copy of report from last sabbatical, if applicable.

6. Ordinarily, priority will be given to those applications that:

    a. propose a full year leave rather than a single semester (the former returns 40% of academic salary to the college for replacement hires; the latter returns no dollars to the college)

    b. provide compelling evidence of contribution to the development of the individual faculty member, to the Area, and to the College

    c. deliver clear support of the FCB mission and strategic plan and the NAU mission

    d. display clearly the outcomes and deliverables resulting from the leave as well as a plan and calendar for leave activities

    e. offer a plan for sharing and using the deliverables of the leave with the College and the larger academic or business community

    f. other things being equal, preference will be given to those who have gone longest without a leave beyond the required six years of continuous service at NAU.

7. The Dean may provide guidance to individual faculty about the completeness and substance that may need to be added to the sabbatical application plan. This guidance is meant to help faculty to understand and meet the Dean's expectations during the sabbatical. This guidance is complementary to and does not replace any that may be offered to the faculty member by the FCB P&T Committee

8. The leave plan, once fully approved, will become the Statement of Expectations of the faculty member for the period of the leave. Together with outcomes of the leave, the leave plan will be used to evaluate the faculty member's performance during the leave.

9. Publication of sabbatical leave results is strongly encouraged.

10. A written report covering activities and outcomes completed during the leave is required during the semester following completion of the sabbatical leave (Sec. 1.7.1). Due dates will be forthcoming from the Dean's office and are usually early in the semester. This timing helps the FCB P&T Committee plan and even out its evaluation workload.

11. Faculty cancellation of sabbatical:

    a. If a faculty member decides not to take a previously granted sabbatical, she or he may re-apply for sabbatical. However, if the faculty member applies within the following three years, the proposal must include a solid justification for why the previous sabbatical was not taken.

Cancellation of a sabbatical also may affect the priority status within the faculty member's area for future sabbaticals.

b. If a faculty member decides not to take an approved sabbatical, she or he must notify the College by March 1 (for a sabbatical starting in the Fall semester) or by August 1 (for a sabbatical starting in the Spring semester) in order to receive consideration for cancellation of the sabbatical. Five months notice will enable the College to change any planned resource or financial commitments.

c. A faculty member cannot cancel their sabbatical if she or he fails to notify the College by the deadlines indicated above and the College has made a commitment to hire a replacement faculty member in their area. If resource commitments have not been made, then the request to cancel a sabbatical shall be considered but not automatically granted.

d. The faculty member should not be penalized for canceling a sabbatical if the circumstances leading to cancellation were beyond the control of the faculty member. Thus, the P & T Committee will review any requests to cancel a sabbatical on a case-by-case basis.

Appendix A: Evaluation Matrix (Student-related activities for Business Division Faculty)[1]

Evaluation Dimensions	Instructional Design	Instructional Delivery	Instructional Assessment	Non-teaching Responsibilities to Students
Information Sources	• Area Representative on ARC **OR** Area Coordinator input from review of class materials (syllabi, assessment materials, and text book) • Faculty Workload Form • GPA	• Faculty Narrative (optional) • Student Evaluations	• Student Evaluations • Area Coordinator Input on number and variety of assessments.	Faculty Workload Form
Dimension Description	Instructional Design skills are those Technical skills in designing and sequencing experiences.	Instructional Delivery skills are human interactive skills and characters that promote or facilitate learning.	Instructional assessments skills are those skills in developing tools, procedures and strategies for assessing student learning and providing meaningful feedback.	Non-teaching responsibilities to students include those activities that support the teaching process, atypical teaching conditions and other activities that enhance the student experience.

Criteria to Consider (examples)	• Clarity (this portion of the evaluation deals with actual in-the-classroom performance of the faculty member. Management of the classroom hour and effective communication with students are the important factors considered here.)
	• Clarity and completeness of syllabus
	• Organization (course content)
	• Rigor
	• Currency of content
		• Communications
		  o Variety of tools
		  o Use of class time
		• Student interaction
		  o Responsiveness
		  o Accessibility
		  o Office hours
		  o Email, etc.
			• Assessment feedback, type and frequency
			• Variety of assessments
				• Number and type of advisees
				• Work with student groups
				• Curriculum development
				• Teaching for good of area (e.g. MBA etc.)
				• Number of preps
				    o Number of new preps
				    o Number of sections
				• Class size
				• Outreach (resource acquisition for teaching on student activities, internships,, independent studies.)
				• Course coordination management

Instruction for Faculty Member	Turn in syllabi, representative exams and other assessments/activities.	Complete narrative to clarify exceptional circumstances that should be considered by	Turn in representative exams and other assessments.	Review and enter data on faculty workload form

---

[1] Any changes to this Appendix must be approved by a majority of the Business Division Faculty. One-year instructors and part-time faculty are not eligible to vote on changes to this section.

		COFS (optional); 300 words or less.		

Appendix B: Intellectual Conributions Matrix*
Business Division Faculty[2]

Discussion on Tiers

All intellectual contributions by Business Division Faculty will be tiered to assist in the tracking of AACSB qualification status, for use in the Annual Review Process, and for use in the recommendations of Promotion and Tenure. Primarily, the tiering of an intellectual contribution is a function of the type of work and the outlet for that work. Different types of intellectual contributions are eligible for different tiers (for example a book review is only eligible for a Tier 4 rating while peer reviewed articles are eligible for a Tier of 1, 2A, or 2B). Outlets are also tiered using approved lists as described in the next paragraph or by the petition process described below.

The Business Division Faculty have approved several lists for intellectual contribution outlets. Those lists include the Association of Business Schools' *Academic Journal Quality Guide*, the Australian Business Dean's Countil's *Journal Quality List*, and the prior FCB outlet list. With regard to the FCB outlet list, which previously came from the Sedona system, any outlet on that list that has not been reviewed within the past five (5) years shall be categorized as described below.

For the purposes of planning and fairness, the lists will be updated in the Faculty shared drive for Business Division Faculty use at the end of each spring semester regardless of when the list is actually updated by the third party generator of that list. The version of the lists that are in effect when an article is submitted for publication are referred to in this section as the "current version" even if a newer version is available online. If an outlet is tiered higher by the lists while an article is in the review process, the faculty member may appeal for the contribution to be tiered at the new level. If the new tiering of the outlet is lower than the tier at the time of submission, the faculty member will receive the tier at the time of submission. The following two tables address the eligibility of intellectual contribution type for the different tiers and the description of how outlets for intellectual contributions are tiered.

---

[2] Any changes to this Appendix must be approved by a majority of the Business Division Faculty. One-year instructors and part-time faculty are not eligible to vote on changes to this section.

Intellectual Contributions Matrix*
Eligibility of Types of Scholarly Works

Tier 1	Tier 2A	Tier 2B	Tier 3	Tier 4
Peer Reviewed Journal Articles	Peer Reviewed Journal Articles	Peer Reviewed Journal Articles	Articles and Cases in non-Peer Reviewed Professional Journals	Articles or Cases submitted to the FCB Working paper Series
Peer Reviewed Cases	Peer Reviewed Cases	Peer Reviewed Cases		Book Reviews
	Texts with a Significant Adoption Criterion	Chapters and Cases in Books with an Adoption Criterion; Innovative Technological Activities with a Dissemination Criterion	Newsletters or magazines associated with discipline-specific organizations	Instructor Manual, Study Guide, Test Bank, Videos and other Textbook Supplemental Material
	Feasibility Studies, Professional Reports, and Grants with a significant impact		Feasibility Studies, Professional Reports, and Grants with a moderate impact	Feasibility Studies, Professional Reports, and Grants with a minimal impact
				Proceedings, Abstracts, and Paper Presentations at Professional Meetings and Conferences; Participation in Research Colloquia
				In-House Brown Bag Presentations
				Discussant at a Professional Academic Meeting

*See Accompanying Clarification Discussion on Tiers, as well as the petition process to establish or reclassify a journal's tier

Intellectual Contributions Matrix*
Tiering of Intellectual Contribution Outlets

Tier #1: Tier 1 outlets are the highest quality peer reviewed journals that advance pedagogy, practice, or theory in all business disciplines, as well as cross-disciplinary work published outside of the business domain (e.g., engineering, computer science, law, psychology). Outlets in this tier include journals listed in the Quality Grades 3 and 4 in the current version of the Association of Business Schools' *Academic Journal Quality Guide*, and journals that have been classified previously as Tier 1 on the FCB outlet list.

Tier #2A: Tier 2A outlets include higher quality peer reviewed journals that advance pedagogy, practice, or theory in all business disciplines, as well as cross-disciplinary outlets outside of the business domain (e.g., engineering, computer science, law, psychology). Outlets in this tier include journals listed in the Quality Grades 1 and 2 in the current version of the Association of Business Schools' *Academic Journal Quality Guide*, journals listed in the current version of the Australian Business Dean's Council's *Journal Quality List*, and journals that have been classified previously as Tier 2A on the FCB outlet list. In addition to journals on those lists, outlets for this tier are determined by scope – national scope for grants and adoption criteria for texts. While outlets in this tier are not as highly recognized as those in Tier 1, they are highly respected, have high impact, and represent high quality intellectual output.

Tier #2B: Tier 2B outlets include peer-reviewed journals that do not qualify for a Tier 1 or Tier 2A rating, and outlets with less significant adoption criteria or scope. In addition, non-peer-reviewed outlets are eligible for a Tier 2B rating if they are determined to be of sufficient quality. These outlets advance theory, practice or are pedagogical in nature in all business disciplines, as well as cross-disciplinary outlets outside of the business domain (e.g., engineering, computer science, law, psychology)These outlets also include outlets that have been classified previously as Tier 2B on the FCB outlet list.

Tier #3: Tier 3 outlets include non-peer-reviewed journals of lesser quality than those eligible for a Tier 2B rating, newsletters or magazines associated with discipline-specific organizations, conference or professional meeting proceedings and presentations, and outlets with regional scope. These outlets advance theory, practice, or are pedagogical in nature in business disciplines, as well as cross-disciplinary outlets outside of the business domain (e.g. engineering, computer science, law, psychology). These outlets also include outlets that have been classified previously as Tier 3 on the FCB outlet list

Tier #4: Tier 4 outlets include NAU-specific outlets, such as the FCB Working Paper Series and Brown Bag presentations. Additionally, outlets in this tier include less research-focused outlets such as supplemental materials to textbooks, and service as a discussant at a conference. The scope of outlets in Tier 4 will be local in nature.Tier 4 outlets may be business outlets but also includes cross-disciplinary outlets outside of the business domain (e.g. engineering, computer science, law, psychology). This tier also include outlets that have been classified previously as Tier 4 on the FCB outlet list

PETITION PROCESS FOR OUTLETS NOT PREVIOUSLY TIERED

If there is an outlet that does not appear on the current version of the Association of Business Schools' *Academic Journal Quality Guide*, the current version of the Australian Business Deans Council's *Journal Quality List* or has not previously been tiered on the FCB outlet list, the faculty member must provide evidence (as outlined below) that the quality of the outlet is comparable to other outlets already represented in the targeted tier.

If an outlet is currently tiered, either on the most current Association of Business Schools' Academic *Journal Quality Guide*, the most current Australian Business Deans Council's *Journal Quality List,* or the previously tiered FCB outlet list and a faculty member wants to petition that outlet to be re-tiered, the faculty member must provide evidence (as outlined below) that the outlet is comparable to other outlets already represented in the targeted tier.

All petitions should be forwarded to a Research Tiering Committee made up of three faculty members. The Chair of the Research Tiering Committee shall be appointed by the Dean from the pool of Research Award winners (Franke Professors, Arndt Award winner, Marley Professor, Bilby Chair, Researcher of the Year, or other research award winners) and shall serve a one-year term with eligibility for reappointment. The remaining two members shall be elected by the faculty. Elected members will serve three year terms. Faculty members eligible for election on the Research Tiering Committee include academically qualified faculty (SA or SP, including research award winners and those who are not award recipients) who received a rating of "highly meritorious" in Scholarship/research/creative activities and/or Professional Development in the election year.

The Research Tiering Committee will assess the type of intellectual contribution and the quality of the outlet separately, and then will make a formal recommendation to the Dean with information on the recommended tier for the intellectual contribution based on the type of intellectual contribution and the type of outlet. All final tiering decisions rest with the Dean.

For a Tier 1 petition, the faculty member must make a comparison to at least two outlets with current Tier 1 ratings and provide evidence using as much data from the following categories as is available: comparisons on acceptance rates, journal readership and circulation, journal impact factors, journal citation counts, published discipline-specific academic rankings and other ranking sources (e.g., Thomson Scientific ISI Journal Citation Reports, SCImago Journal and Country Ranking, Journal-Ranking.com, eigenFACTOR.org, CEFAGE-UE Journal Ranking in Economics and Management).

For a Tier 2A or 2B petition, the faculty member must make a comparison to at least one outlet with a current rating that matches the requested tier, and provide evidence using as much data from the following categories as is available: comparisons on acceptance rates, journal readership and circulation, journal impact factors, journal citation counts, published discipline-specific academic rankings and other ranking sources (e.g., Thomson Scientific ISI Journal Citation Reports, SCImago Journal and Country Ranking, Journal-Ranking.com, eigenFACTOR.org, CEFAGE-UE Journal Ranking in Economics and Management).

Appendix C: Professional Development MatrixTo Maintain Professional Qualification – Business Division Faculty[3]			
Input Based Formula: 5 hours = 1 point (Output Based Point Totals are Provided)			
	Description	Hours Completed (Point totals for output measures)	Points Earned
Practitioner Activity			
Consulting			-
Work in area of business/teaching discipline			-
Work in academic administrative capacity			-
Internship with a company			-
Field research projects			-
Expert witness testimony			-
Development of industry or government relations for area of discipline (internships, panels, guest speakers)			-
Consulting report (writing of)			-
		Total Practitioner:	-
Professional Activity			
Professional membership continuing education			-
Professional development conference			-

---

[3] Any changes to this Appendix must be approved by a majority of the Business Division Faculty. One-year instructors and part-time faculty are not eligible to vote on changes to this section.

Board member or committee member of a for-profit or non-profit organization			-
Contribute area of expertise to an NAU entity			-
Deliver a professional seminar related to area of business expertise			-
Newsletter/Reports with readership > 100		15	-
Attainment of discipline specific certification			
- Tier 1 (CPA/CFA/CMA/CFE/CIISP/BAR PASSAGE)		30	
- Tier 2		20	
- Tier 3 (MCAS)		10	
Intellectual contributions	See Intellectual Contributions Matrix for Tier Descriptions (please note that ICs cannot count in more than one place)		
- Tier 1	40 points		
- Tier 2A	20 points		
- Tier 2B	10 points		
- Tier 3	5 points		
- Tier 4	5 points		
Education media/software development in a business discipline			-
Completion or significant participant of grant application			-
Leadership role in a professional organization			-
		Total Professional:	-

Teaching Activity			
Relevant coursework (discipline or teaching specific)			-
Attendance at teaching program			-
Independent study leading to certification, area specialization, or other professional development			
Workshop participation			-
Book publication in business discipline		20	
Publication of instructor's manual, test bank, readings or other ancillary information			-
Development and integration of new instructional technology			-
Completion of seminars, short courses, or other programs			-
Peer review of papers or texts			-
		Total Teaching:	-
		Total Points:	**-**
		Practitioner/ Professional Points:	-
		% of Total (Min 75%):	

Level of Teaching   Definition of "Professional experience should be relevant to the faculty member's teaching assignment, significant in duration and level of responsibility, and current at the time of hiring"

100 – 200 level   Line level manager or above, at least 5 years of managerial experience

300 – 400 level

Senior level manager with multiple direct reports who themselves are at least line managers with at least five years of experience at this level

Graduate

Executive experience in a firm of sufficient size to be publicly traded or equivalent sized non-profit organization with at least five years of experience at this level

Appendix D: Evaluation of Instructional Design Dimension of Student-related activities Worksheet for Business Division Faculty[4]

This document will be a spreadsheet for Area Coordinators to complete with drop-down selectors for Area and Yes/No.

Worksheet- Instructional Design					
Area	Select from Drop Down				
Area Coordinator					
Semester					
Faculty Name	Outcomes clearly stated in the syllabus*	Course Content matches stated outcomes*	Textbook is appropriate for the course content and level of rigor*	The frequency and variety of assignments and exams are appropriate*	Syllabus matches the master syllabus *
	Yes or No	Yes or No	Yes/No/Unable to Assess	Yes or No	Yes or No
	Yes or No	Yes or No	Yes/No/Unable to Assess	Yes or No	Yes or No
* If no, please specify the course(s) and explain the shortcoming:					
Optional Additional Comments:					

---

[4] Any changes to this Appendix must be approved by a majority of the Business Division Faculty. One-year instructors and part-time faculty are not eligible to vote on changes to this section.

**NORTHERN ARIZONA
UNIVERSITY**
The W. A. Franke College of Business

Annual Review Self-Evaluation Form

Directions: Complete this document and attach it in Faculty180 under "Self-Evaluation." In Faculty180 – please go to "MY DATA" and then "Workload Form."

Evaluations are performed by the Annual Review Committee using information provided by the faculty member on the self-evaluation form, information provided in Faculty 180 including the faculty member's CV. Ratings are based on the criteria in the most recent COFS document and the faculty member's statement of expectations for the review period.

Responsibilities to students:

1. Please copy the information from your SOE related to responsibilities to students including percentage allocation:

2. Teaching is evaluated using the Evaluation Matrix – Student-Related Activities found in Appendix A of COFS (add link to COFS in shared drive), and the rating guidelines found on page ___ of the COFS document. Please provide information on each of the following categories:

    a. Instructional Design: Teaching materials should be uploaded in to Faculty180 for committee evaluation. Describe here your approach to managing the course design including organization, rigor and currency of content. Please include your gpas by class (See current FCB gpa guideline on page ____ of COFS and address any significant deviations from these guidelines]. (300 word maximum)

b. Instructional Delivery: Describe your approach to delivering course materials including communication tools, use of class time and student interaction. (300 word maximum)

c. Instructional Assessment: Describe types and frequency of assessment and feedback to students. (300 word maximum)

d. Non-teaching Responsibilities to Students: Describe any non-teaching activities that support the teaching process (see the matrix for examples of these types of activities).(300 word maximum)

Scholarly Activities and Professional Qualifications

1.Please copy the information from your SOE under Research and Scholarly Activity including percentage allocation.

2. Scholarly Activity is evaluated using the either the Intellectual Contributions matrix found in Appendix B of the COFS document (add link to COFS in shared drive), OR the Professional Development matrix found in Appendix C of the COFS document, and the rating guidelines found on page _____ of the COFS document.

3. Please indicate whether you were AACSB qualified during the evaluation period as:

   ___Scholarly Academic

___Practice Academic
___Scholarly Practitioner
___Instructional Practitioner.

If you were a Scholarly Academic, please indicate the year until which you are qualified: _____

   a. Scholarly Academics and Scholarly Practitioners: Please list any intellectual contributions accepted during the evaluation period, plus the previous two evaluation periods, the date of **acceptance** and the tier of those contributions. [Note: The review period for scholarly activity is a three year window.] Please list all intellectual contributions in Tier order (Tier 1 on top and Tier 4 on bottom). Please be sure this information is also reflected in your current CV in Faculty 180.

INTELLECTUAL CONTRIBUTION	ACCEPTANCE DATE	TIER

b. Please list any current working papers or significant works in progress.

c. In Faculty 180, include copies of acceptance letters and copies of articles accepted for publication during the evaluation period (or links to articles if published during the evaluation period).

d. Practice Academics and Instructional Practitioners must upload their PQ matrix under "Self-Evaluation" in Faculty180. For Professionally Qualified faculty members, the Annual Review Committee will review the PQ matrix submitted in Faculty 180. However, please provide any information you would like to clarify in number 4 below.

4. Please provide any other information you would like to share with the evaluation committee regarding your research or professional development, including an optional statement on the impact or potential impact of your intellectual contributions. (300 word maximum)

Service
1. Please copy the information from your SOE under Service including percentage allocation.

2. Service is evaluated using and the rating guidelines found on page ___ of the COFS document.

3. Service Activities: List your service activities, your role, and the estimated time commitment. Please note that paid activities do not count as service. Course Coordination, service as an Area Coordinator, Summer committee work that is paid, committees that are a part of an administrative assignment, and similar paid activities should not be included as service. In addition, if an activity appears in a PQ matrix, that activity should not be counted as service.

Service Activity (Please list FCB service first followed by University, Profession, Community)	Role (e.g. chair, member)	Estimated Time Commitment (per month)
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		

2. Please provide any other information you would like to share with the evaluation committee regarding your service activities. Please include any relevant information such as special projects you did, how your service impacted an organization, etc.(300 word maximum)

Other

Note: This section should only be completed if you have an SOE percentage in the "Other" category.

1. Please copy the information from your SOE under Other including percentage allocation.

2. "Other" responsibilities are evaluated by the FCB Dean, rather than the Annual Review Committee. However, a description of these responsibilities will help the Committee to understand the full scope of the work that you do.

3. Please provide any information you would like to share with the evaluation committee regarding your "other" activities (300 word maximum).