College of Business Framework and Standards For
Contract Renewal and Promotion

Preamble

The Peer Review Committee (PRC) adopts as its principal purpose the commitment to encourage faculty growth and development that benefits the entire faculty, the mission of the University, the COB, and the community in which we reside. Fundamental to this commitment is the recruitment, selection, recognition and retention of quality faculty members. Providing incentives and rewards for superior performance is a means of assuring the continuing existence of a vital faculty. Advancement in rank is recognition of accomplishments and a sign of confidence that the individual is capable of greater achievements and of assuming greater responsibilities. The PRC supports the success of faculty by fostering high standards, fairness, and consistency and abides by the standards established by the Faculty Affairs Team. The PRC also recognizes and supports the responsibilities of each faculty member to treat students, staff and colleagues in a collegial manner.

The PRC acknowledges that the Professional Development Plan (PDP) serves as the basis for faculty evaluation and feels that PDPs should be flexible. But the PRC encourages faculty to consider the norms for promotion and for renewal or tenure when preparing their PDPs. To be realistic, the PDP should be both challenging and attainable and should demonstrate continued progress in teaching, scholarship, and service. The PRC also recognizes that when faculty members focus only on short-term goals, it is often to the detriment of long-term performance. Thus, the PRC encourages the faculty and the administration to view annual faculty performance as part of an integrated, long-term performance rather than a series of independent short-term activities.

In the event that the College of Business Framework is in conflict or inconsistent with the Faculty Performance Evaluation Document (FPED), the latter shall prevail as to meaning, effect, and implementation, except to the extent that the Framework contains higher or stricter standards (including those established by the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business—International).

Addendum:
All references to dates and/or timelines in the College of Business Framework and Standards for Contract Renewal and Promotion are replaced with the statement: Refer to the current version of the Faculty Performance Evaluation Document (FPED).
(Approved by the faculty of the Lutgert College of Business: 2-5-2010)

I. Evaluation Framework

Within the context of its mission, the College of Business affirms its commitment to continuous improvement by seeking excellence in teaching, service, and scholarship. The College affirms its commitment to the University mission and goals.

Teaching

Faculty members should make contributions to the process of teaching on a continuing basis appropriate to the College of Business's mission.

Basis for Judgment: In developing and applying evaluation criteria, the reviewers (as defined by faculty affairs) will consider a variety of faculty efforts such as standards that are developed in the criteria for measuring faculty performance (Appendix I). Appendix I was developed with the input of faculty, but may be revised as a natural process in the continuing development of the College. The body of faculty member's teaching contributions will be judged based upon the period preceding the review–beginning with the contract hire date or the previous promotion (whichever comes later).

Service

Faculty members should make service contributions on a continuing basis appropriate to the College of Business's mission.

Basis for Judgment: The service contributions (as defined in Appendix I) of the College of Business faculty should be viewed as an assortment of activities supporting the College and/or University's particular mission. The body of faculty member's service contributions will be judged based upon the period preceding the review–beginning with the contract hire date or the previous promotion (whichever comes later).

Scholarship

Faculty members should make intellectual contributions on a continuing basis appropriate to the College of Business's mission. Producing intellectual contributions represents a core set of responsibilities of higher education for business. The outputs from intellectual contributions should be available for public scrutiny by academic peers within and without the College of Business.

Basis for Judgment: The intellectual contributions of the College of Business (COB) faculty should be viewed as a portfolio supporting the College's particular mission and consistent with accrediting bodies. The body of intellectual contributions (as defined in this document) will be judged based upon the period deemed appropriate for the activity (rank, tenure, etc.) being sought by the candidate.

II. Annual Review

In accordance with Article 10 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, at the end of each academic year the supervisor will assess the faculty member's successful completion of the activities set out in the PDP. This assessment may include review of self, peer, and student evaluations of teaching, self and peer evaluation of non-instructional activity prescribed in the PDP, and pertinent documentation to substantiate successful completion of the tasks stipulated in the PDP. If a faculty member meets the goals laid out in the PDP, subject to minimums in Appendix I, this will result in a satisfactory annual review (i.e., meets expectations or above).

III. Standards for Contract Renewal, Tenure and Promotion

A. *Contract Faculty Renewal*

Normally, in order to be recommended for a contract renewal, the faculty member is expected to "*Meet Expectations*" (as defined in Appendix I*)* in all three areas over the course of their contract.

As with any contract renewal, repeated poor performance (below expectations) over the contract period is likely to result in a non-renewal decision. The PDP will serve as the principal tool for identifying and rectifying performance deficiencies over the course of any one contract.

B. *Faculty Promotion*

Faculty seeking promotion must submit a letter of their intentions to the VPAA as defined in the FPED. College of Business faculty must send the Dean of the College of Business a copy of the letter on the same schedule.

Faculty intending to seek promotion may submit their dossier to the Peer Review Committee for feedback in the years prior to the year in which they submit their letter of intention. The Peer review Committee will then provide verbal and/or written nonbinding feedback to the faculty member making the request.

Assistant Professors

It is expected that Assistant professors, in conjunction with their departments chair, faculty mentors, and/or the peer review committee, will be preparing for promotion to the Associate Professor rank. While the annual reviews will be a barometer for assessing readiness for promotion, the promotion decision will involve an assessment of the totality of a faculty member's contribution over the course of the time period as an Assistant Professor. Promotion recommendations are made according to the criteria in Appendix VI. A record of strong annual evaluations is not by itself sufficient to earn a recommendation for promotion to Associate Professor. The evaluation for promotion will be performed by the Peer Review Committee, senior faculty members, the Department Chair and the Dean.

Associate Professors

In order to qualify for promotion to Professor, a candidate should have an established reputation as a highly effective teacher, scholar and professional, and a demonstrated capacity for leadership. It is expected that Associate Professors, in conjunction with their department chair, faculty mentors, and/or the peer review committee, will continually seek to improve their performance and work toward achieving the rank of Professor. While the annual reviews will be a barometer for assessing readiness for promotion, the promotion decision will involve an assessment of the totality of a faculty member's contributions over the course of the time period. Evaluation of a faculty member's contributions will cover the person's entire academic career with primary emphasis placed on the time period commencing with promotion to Associate Professor. Promotion recommendations are made according to the criteria in Appendix VI. A record of strong annual evaluations is not, by itself, sufficient to earn a recommendation for promotion to Professor. The

evaluation for promotion will be performed by the Peer Review Committee, faculty with the rank of Professor, the Department Chair and the Dean.

Other Qualifying Factors

Except under extraordinary circumstances, a faculty member needs to have completed at least four academic years in rank to be eligible for promotion. However, sufficient time should exist between either the starting date or the last promotion date and the date of application for promotion to allow a faculty member to be adequately and fairly evaluated.

C. Summary Review of Senior Faculty

To ensure the continued contributions of all faculty, regardless of rank or tenure status, a process should be developed to perform a summary review of professors. The process should be consistent with any post-tenure review policies and guidelines established by the Board of Governors, FGCU Board of Trustees, FGCU Faculty Affairs, and the United Faculty of Florida.

III.   General Remarks

All parties concerned should recognize that meritorious factors will be brought to bear on personnel decisions. Just meeting technical minimum performance standards in criteria may not be a sufficient record for continuation and advancement. Renewal, tenure or promotion result as a consequence of demonstrated achievement; that is, continuation and advancement are based on merit consistent with the mission of the University and the COB, and is not automatic over the long-term. In the end, a complex judgment must be drawn which is intended to strengthen the quality of the faculty.

Appendix I

"Meets Expectations" Minimums for Annual Reviews

In annual reviews the supervisor will evaluate faculty performance in each of the three areas of Teaching, Scholarship and Service as exceeds expectation, meets expectations or below expectations. Factors to consider in this decision are discussed here, as are guidelines for determining performance that Meets Expectations. Although the College recognizes that individuals are unique, these factors should be weighed when writing PDPs and, therefore, when evaluating faculty performance.

TEACHING

Both the **effort** and **quality of teaching** will be evaluated. Effort will be evaluated by such measures as the number of preparations, numbers of students and type of class (EMBA, distance learning, new course, etc.). Quality will be assessed by teacher/course evaluations and such measures as peer evaluation of instruction, exit interviews and alumni surveys.

The following factors and measures may be used in the evaluation of performance in teaching. Although weights given to measures of teaching may vary for individual situations, teacher/course evaluations will not be considered for more than 50% of the evaluation of teaching performance and their consideration will follow a segmentation approach to ensure compatibility. For example, upper division classes will be compared to other upper division classes of similar rigor and size, and distance learning classes will be compared to distance learning classes.

Effort Measures
- Level of Courses (Undergraduate; Graduate; & EMBA)
- Number of Preparations – also look at Release time
- New preparations
- Course development and enhancement
- Distance teaching
- Accessibility
- Internship supervision
- Structured Mentorship Activities

Quality Measures

- Course Evaluations (not to be weighted more than 50% of total teaching evaluation)
- Peer assessment
- Review of course materials, including syllabus and assessment materials
- Teaching Innovations
- Teaching Awards
- Outside Recognition
- Alumni Interviews
- Exit Interviews
- Measured Learning Outcomes

Other Measures

- Program Development
- Outside Classroom Development Activities
- Collaborative Teaching
- Interdisciplinary Development
- Teaching Related Activities

SCHOLARSHIP

The College of Business recognizes that, by its very nature, scholarship cannot be divided into discrete annual units. Therefore, scholarship criteria are described more broadly than those for teaching and service. Although publications have been quantified, it is recognized that evaluating scholarship goes beyond counting publications. It is the faculty member's responsibility to document the nature and quality of publications and publication outlets for all reviews.

The minimum acceptable performance in scholarship over a three-year period consists of 1 refereed publication (see below) and 2 refereed proceedings or conference presentations (or the equivalent). An individual "Meets Expectations" in a given year when scholarship activities during that year clearly contribute toward that outcome for the rolling 3-year period. Annual evaluations of scholarship should thus consider papers in progress, papers submitted and under review, papers accepted for publication, and papers published, as well as the nature and quality of the publications and publication outlets.

The following measures should be considered in the evaluation of performance in scholarship. Groupings of scholarship are listed in order of validation by College faculty. Note: Refereed scholarship is weighed more heavily than non-refereed scholarship. Within each category (Refereed and Non-refereed) publications are given the most weight. Weights given to the other categories will be discipline dependent.

Scholarship

Refereed Scholarship
Publications (e.g. journal articles; academic books)
Cases and Case Presentations
Edited Works/Chapters in Books
Presentations
Proceedings

Non-Refereed Scholarship
Publications (e.g. journal articles; proceedings; book chapters, books)
Cases and Case Presentations
Policy Papers
Presentations
Published Book Reviews

SERVICE
     Demonstrated service is measured by meaningful contributions to university, college, department, professional organizations, and/or community activities. This includes service such as active, contributing committee memberships, leadership in professional organizations and service to the community. The following measures should be considered in the evaluation of performance in service. Weights given to measures of service may vary for individual situations.

Service

Involvement in Professional Organizations
Student Organization Activities
University – Committees, Leadership Roles
Department – Committees, Leadership Roles
Leadership Roles in Community Organizations
College – Committees, Leadership Roles
Editorial Board Membership
Officer in Professional Organizations
Mentoring
Involvement in Outside Boards
Presentations to Community Groups
Organizing Symposia, Workshops, Meetings
University Consulting
Private Consulting
Pro-Bono Consulting
Service Awards
Accrediting, Licensing, and Agency Roles
Involvement in Institutes
Discussant, Chair Sessions at Conferences
Reviewing Articles
Reviewing Books for publishers
Grant applications
Grants received

Appendix II

Guidelines for the Annual Review Process

Pre-Review Process: Prior to the spring break, the chairs and the dean will meet as a group to generally discuss performance standards and their application in the annual faculty review. This initial discussion will include an overview assessment exercise conducted with the department chairs.

Review Timeframe: The chairs will conduct the initial phase of the annual review process during the following time frame: May 15 – June 15. The written summary regarding the faculty member's performances will be based on a 12-month period prior to the annual faculty contract date of May 6 and includes the summer, fall and spring academic semesters. For new faculty, the annual review will encompass the time period that the faculty member has actually worked at FGCU. It is understood that the College's review of faculty performance is inconsistent with the University's FPED, which entails a spring, summer, fall evaluation of a faculty member's teaching.

Report: Upon completion of evaluation, the chair completes a draft review (Performance Review Report). This summary regarding performance must include a statement regarding progress towards reappointment (if applicable) and/or promotion (if applicable).

Consistency Review: Prior to any discussion of the *draft* review involving the faculty member and the chair, the annual Performance Review Report *drafts* will be provided to the dean. Following a review of the *draft* documents from all chairs, the dean and representatives from the Peer Review and Faculty Advisory Committees will meet with the chairs as a group to discuss issues of rating consistency across the College. After the meeting, chairs will provide a *draft* Performance Review Report summary regarding performance to the faculty member. A signed copy of the each final Performance Review Report will then be provided to the dean.

Internal College Review: After the Performance Review Report is signed by both the chair and the faculty member, the faculty member may append a written statement to the report. Faculty signature does not indicate agreement or disagreement with the report. The faculty member may request a meeting with the dean to discuss the annual evaluation if the faculty member believes there has been a violation of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). The meeting request must be submitted in written or e-mail form. The faculty member may also request assistance from the Peer Review Committee. These informal appeals are not required and will in no way abridge the faculty member's rights under Article 20 of the CBA.

Professional Development Plan (PDP): Following the completion of the annual Performance Review Report, the PDP will then be finalized by the faculty member and the chair, with an effort to provide the dean's office with a copy before August 31. The individual PDPs will be transmitted to the University by the dean's office.

^^

SUMMARY TIMETABLE

1. Late April-May 15 – Faculty organize evaluation materials for chairs
2. May 15-June 15 – Chair and faculty member discuss/complete evaluation.
3. June 15-September 1 – Faculty member and chair complete PDP.
4. 3 weeks prior to the end of the semester – Faculty member submits FAR report for upcoming semester.

Appendix III

Documentation for Reviews

Documentation required from the faculty for Annual, Multi-Year Fixed Contract Renewal, Continuing Multi-Year Appointment Extension, and Promotion, Tenure and Post-Tenure Review includes:

ANNUAL REVIEW
Essential Portfolio Materials

Essential portfolio materials should address objectives in PDP and MUST include the following:

- Updated curriculum vitae
- Professional Development Plan (PDP), which includes faculty objectives
- Annual Professional Development Report, including amendments to PDP, statements of how the objectives of the PDP have been met and self-assessment.
- For teaching: Frequency distribution of grades by class; mean response (weighted by number of responses) and range of responses to Items 1-8 on the State University System Student Assessment of Instruction Form.
- For scholarship: copies of scholarly documents; documentation of nature and quality of publication outlets (such as Cabell's acceptance rate, letter documenting acceptance rate from editor); copies of work under review, and description of work in progress
- For service: description of service activities.

Recommended Portfolio Materials

Recommended portfolio materials should address objectives in PDP and support their achievement and may include the following:

- For teaching: Peer observation & assessment of instruction, student evaluations, written student comments, syllabi, self-assessment for review period
- For scholarship: copies of work in progress.
- Other relevant information such as signed letters from students, colleagues, faculty from other institutions, editors, community members, and practitioners in the field.

Provided by Department Chair
- Prior Annual Performance Review Reports with recommendations for improvement (if any) and supporting documentation
- Faculty Activity Reports
- List of college, university, professional, community and economic development service activities from Faculty Resource Management Plan Database
- Other relevant information such as signed letters from students, colleagues, faculty from other institutions, editors, community members, and practitioners in the field.

FIXED MULTI-YEAR SUCCESSIVE CONTRACT REVIEW
Essential Portfolio Materials

- Updated curriculum vitae
- Cumulative information from previous annual reviews.
- Current year information equivalent to that provided for annual reviews
- Documentation of the nature and quality of publication outlets (such as Cabell's acceptance rate, letter documenting acceptance rate from editor); copies of work under review
- Review of service when service is a component of the PDP.
- Peer observation & assessment of instruction

Recommended Portfolio Materials

Recommended portfolio materials should address objectives in PDP and support their achievement and may include the following:

- For teaching: student evaluations, syllabi, self-assessment for review period
- For scholarship: copies of work in progress.
- Other relevant information such as signed letters from students, colleagues, faculty from other institutions, editors, community members, and practitioners in the field.

Provided by Supervisor
- Prior Annual Performance Review Reports with recommendations for improvement (if any) and supporting documentation
- Faculty Activity Reports
- List of college, university, professional, community and economic development service activities from Faculty Resource Management Plan Database
- Other relevant information such as signed letters from students, colleagues, faculty from other institutions, editors, community members, and practitioners in the field.

CONTINUING MULTI-YEAR APPOINTMENT EXTENSION
Essential Portfolio Materials

Essential portfolio materials should address objectives in PDP and MUST include the following:
- Updated curriculum vitae
- Current year information equivalent to that provided for annual reviews

- Documentation of the nature and quality of publication outlets (such as Cabell's acceptance rate, letter documenting acceptance rate from editor); copies of work under review
- Review of service when service is a component of the PDP.

Additional relevant information, such assigned letters from students, editors, colleagues, practitioners

Recommended Portfolio Materials
>   Same as Annual Review.

Provided by Supervisor
>   Same as Annual Review

PROMOTION REVIEW
Essential Portfolio Materials
>   **Essential portfolio materials should address objectives in PDP and MUST include the following:**
- Updated curriculum vitae
- Cumulative information from previous annual reviews.
- Current year information equivalent to that provided for annual reviews
- Documentation of the nature and quality of publication outlets (such as Cabell's acceptance rate, letter documenting acceptance rate from editor); copies of work under review
- Review of service when service is a component of the PDP.
- Peer observation & assessment of instruction
- External review of scholarship (if deemed necessary by faculty member, Peer Review Committee or Chair)
- Documentation of previous years of service in rank credited toward promotion by unit Dean/Director, if applicable

Recommended Portfolio Materials
>   Same as Annual Review.

Provided by Supervisor
>   Same as Annual Review

POST-TENURE REVIEW
- Updated curriculum vitae
- Cumulative information from previous six annual evaluations
- Current year information equivalent to that provided for annual reviews, only if an extended Post-Tenure Review (Sustained Performance Evaluation) is required (FGCU Faculty Performance Evaluation Document)
- Any Performance Improvement Plans

Appendix IV
(Draft Working Document, 4/23/2001)

PEER ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

The peer review committee suggests that the following items be considered when putting together your section on "peer assessment of teaching" for promotion and/or contract renewal:

1)   A statement about how your teaching has evolved throughout your career. This might include items such as new innovations to your courses, technology you have learned and incorporated, new types of assignments you have tried, revisions you have made to your courses, etc.

2)   Copies of your SUSSAI student evaluations. You are required by the CBA to include the 8 standard questions. The additional questions and open-ended responses are optional. When applying for promotion, include comparable materials from previous universities for the time you have been in rank.

3)   Copies of your annual reviews from FGCU. Include comparable materials from your previous universities for promotion.

4)   Include syllabi that demonstrate your teaching effectiveness - updated course readings and text, current topics, etc. and how a class has evolved.

5)   Copies of any teaching awards you have received and the criteria for the award.

6)   Peer observation of your teaching in at least one class is recommended. It is recommended that
the observer reviews the course syllabus, objectives, etc. before observing your class. The observer should complete the form at the end of this appendix. Include this form and any related correspondence/letter attachments in your portfolio.

CLASS VISITATION EVALUATION FORM

INSTRUCTOR: _____ **COURSE/SECTION:** _____

EVALUATOR: _____ **DATE OF EVALUATION:** _____

1. Briefly explain the subject matter being taught and the format of the class (e.g. lecture, lab, group work…)

2. Does the instructor seem well prepared?

3. Does the instructor synthesize, interpret and summarize effectively?

4. Does the instructor adjust to class level of comprehension, explain new/different concepts, and tolerate disagreement?

5. Does the instructor hold student interest, encourage opinions and questions?

6. Does the instructor make effective use of examples, blackboards, use appropriate voice speed, modulation and language?

7. Comments (Place additional comments here or attach a statement):

Appendix V

MENTORSHIP

The process used to guide and mentor faculty involves two components. The first component occurs as part of the annual review process. In the spring of each academic year, the faculty member prepares an Annual Professional Development Report that includes statements of how the objectives of the PDP have been met. The department chair then prepares a Performance Review Report as a written summary regarding the faculty member's performance over the period under review. The summary includes an overall assessment of whether the faculty member exceeds, meets or does not meet the stated objectives in the areas of teaching, service and intellectual contributions. It also includes a statement regarding progress toward reappointment (if applicable), tenure (if applicable), and/or promotion. Should deficiencies be identified, a Performance Improvement Plan listing constructive improvements to be undertaken by the faculty member is developed jointly by the faculty member and the supervisor. This is the point at which a formal mentor program is encouraged for the benefit of the faculty member. The source document for this process is Section V, Annual Review, *FGCU Faculty Performance Evaluation Document*.

The second component available in the process to guide and mentor faculty is the mentor program available to faculty candidates for successive multiyear appointments, continuing multiyear appointments, promotion, and tenure. Faculty candidates may request, on a voluntary basis, a senior faculty member in the College (or even the University) as a mentor early in the review process. Mentors assist faculty in self-evaluation of the potential for a successful candidacy and in the assembling of portfolio documentation. Mentors may also formally participate in the annual, successive multiyear appointment, promotion, tenure and/or post-tenure performance review process. The following excerpt from Section V, *FGCU Faculty Performance Evaluation Document* provides the procedure for formal participation of the mentor in the review process:

> At the time of portfolio submission, a faculty member may request in writing that a colleague participate in the review. This colleague may include his/her mentor or other FGCU colleague (or member of the Peer Review Committee for annual reviews). The colleague with the faculty member's written consent may examine all submitted material and may observe the supervisor's discussion with the faculty member. In the case of reappointment, promotion, tenure or post-tenure reviews, the colleague does not participate in the peer review committee's final decision making.

Appendix VI

PROMOTION GUIDELINES

A.   Teaching

Since teaching is the primary mission of FGCU all faculty applying for promotion must demonstrate a high proficiency in teaching. Both the effort and quality of teaching will be evaluated. Effort will be evaluated by such measures as the number of preparations, numbers of students and type of class (EMBA, distance learning, new course, etc.). Quality will be assessed by teacher/course evaluations and such measures as peer evaluation of instruction, exit interviews and alumni surveys.

Promotion from Assistant to Associate

In order to qualify for promotion to Associate Professor, candidates should have demonstrated effective teaching in the courses assigned to them. Though results for all semesters will be examined, semesters in the latter half of the candidate's career will be given the most weight.

Promotion from Associate to Full

In order to qualify for promotion to Professor, candidates should have an established reputation as a highly effective teacher and demonstrate evidence of this effectiveness as measured by quality and effort since promotion to associate. This includes taking a leadership role in curriculum development and course development in their field; demonstration of effective teaching as reflected in student evaluations and peer review; an ongoing commitment to staying current in the field; and dissemination of teaching experience and skills to others in their academic field.

Demonstration of Leadership

- Service on curriculum development committees (Department, College, and University)
- Service on assessment and measurement committees
- Mentoring of junior faculty
- Internship and senior project/thesis supervision
- Course material publication in journals, textbooks, cases, internet repositories

Documenting Teaching Ability

The measures that may be used in the evaluation of teaching performance are listed below. Although the weights given to measures of teaching may vary for individual situations, the weight assigned to teacher/course evaluations shall not exceed 40% and may be less than 40%. Additionally, their consideration will follow a segmentation approach to ensure comparability. For example, upper division classes will be compared to other upper division classes of similar rigor and size.

Effort Measures

- Level of courses (Undergraduate; Graduate; & EMBA)
- Number of preparations – also look at release time
- New preparations
- Course development and enhancement
- Distance teaching
- Accessibility
- Internship supervision
- Structured mentorship activities
- Publication of teaching notes, textbooks, textbook chapters
- Teaching innovations
- Number of new skills acquired, certifications, training courses/seminars attended
- Program development
- Outside classroom development activities
- Collaborative teaching
- Interdisciplinary development
- Teaching related activities

Quality Measures

- **Rigor**

  - Grade distributions
  - Number and type of assignments
  - Number and type of exams given
  - Scope and size of course projects and papers

- **Course evaluations**

  - The weight assigned to student evaluations of teaching shall not exceed and may be less than 40% among the measures considered in the evaluation of teaching performance.
  - In general, faculty seeking promotion should have a mathematical average of 4.0 out of 5.0 or better on student evaluations and grade distributions for those courses should be reported.
  - For the purposes of establishing the candidates' teaching quality, student evaluation averages will be compared to the averages of colleagues at FGCU teaching the same or similar courses. Categories for comparisons may include:

    - Undergraduate COB core course
    - Undergraduate major required course
    - Undergraduate elective
    - University level service course

- EMBA
- MBA core
- MBA elective
- Undergraduate distance course
- Graduate distance course
- Discipline (ISM, FIN, ACG, MGT, MKT, etc.)

- **Peer assessment**

  o Review of course materials, including syllabus and assessment materials
  o Review of lecturing and classroom management skills

- **Outcome assessment**

  o Alumni interviews
  o Exit interviews
  o Measured learning outcomes

- **Teaching awards and other recognition**.

B.   Scholarly Activity

Promotion to Associate Professor

As a yardstick, the presence of four or more refereed journal publications along with four or more years in rank should serve as a guide for Assistant Professors seeking nonbinding preliminary feedback from the Peer Review Committee. While the issue of the quantity of refereed publications is important as a demonstration of commitment to the culture of inquiry, the quality or rigor of these publications is also of vital concern.

Faculty seeking promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor should have at least six refereed journal publications* that denote a sizeable contribution from the promotion candidate. In other words, single and co-authored publications, as well as tri-authored publications, will be better received than the same number of publications with extensive multiple authors (e.g., five or more co-authors). Among the six refereed publications, the promotion candidate should demonstrate work in highly recognized outlets known for their rigor. The burden of proof for establishing the rigor of one's publications clearly rests with the promotion candidate. In addition, candidates should demonstrate continuous research programs with numerous works-in-progress and refereed journal submissions that evidence high potential for future rigorous publications.

As a general guide, the following presentation of research productivity denotes a pattern of work upon which the Peer Review Committee has ruled favorably:

Lund Dean, K., & **Fornaciari**, C. "How to Create and Use Experiential Case-Based   Exercises in a Management Classroom." *Journal of Management Education*, forthcoming.

Sansone, C., Rodriguez, W., Nakatani, K., Wynekoop, J., Boggs, R., & **Fornaciari**, C. "Best Practices for Motivating Students in e-Courses." *AASA Professor*, forthcoming.

Fornaciari, C., & Lund Dean, K. (2001). "Making the Quantum Leap: Lessons from Physics on Studying Spirituality and Religion in Organizations." *Journal of Organizational Change Management,* 14(4): 335-351.

Rodriguez, W., **Fornaciari**, C., Wynekoop, J., Harrington, T., Nakatani, K., Ruiz-Torres, A., Johnson, D., Boggs, R., & Pendergast, M. (2001). "Information Technology Strategies for Internet-Based Education." *Journal of Informatics Education & Research*, 3(1): 26-40.

Roca, M.L., & **Fornaciari**, C. (2000). "Intimate Learning: The Art of Using Technology to Enhance the Student-Teacher Bond." *Journal for the Art of Teaching,* 7(1): 1-16.

Fornaciari, C., & Roca, M.L. (1999). "The Age of Clutter: Conducting Effective Research Using the Internet." *Journal of Management Education*, 23(6): 732-742.

Fornaciari, C., Forte, M., & Mathews, C. (1999). "Distance Education as Strategy: How Can Your School Compete?" *Journal of Management Education*, 23(6): 703-718.

Fornaciari, C., Lamont, B., Mason, B., & Hoffman, J. (1993). "Incremental and Revolutionary Strategic Change: An Empirical Test of Common Premises." *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 1: 273-290.

Promotion from Associate to Full Professor

As a yardstick, the presence of twelve or more career refereed journal publications along with four or more years in rank should serve as a guide for those Associate Professors seeking nonbinding preliminary feedback from the Peer Review Committee. It is understood that this feedback occurs prior to one's application for promotion.

Candidates seeking promotion from Associate to Full Professor will find a higher "bar" as a full professorship denotes the quintessential rank. Faculty seeking promotion to Full Professor should have nine refereed journal publications* since promotion to Associate Professor. These publications should denote a sizeable contribution from the promotion candidate. In addition, candidates should demonstrate continuous research programs with numerous works-in-progress and refereed journal submissions that evidence high potential for future rigorous publications.

As a general guide, the following presentation beyond the Associate Professor rank denotes a pattern of research productivity upon which the Peer Review Committee has ruled favorably:

Wynekoop, J. "Local Area Networks". In *Encyclopedia of Information Systems.* Academic Press, Harcourt Brace, forthcoming. (Book chapter.)

Sansone, C., Rodriguez, W., Nakatani, K., **Wynekoop, J**., Boggs, R., & Fornaciari, C. "Best Practices for Motivating Students in e-Courses". Forthcoming in *AASA Professor* (Spring 2002).

Rodriguez, W., Fornaciari, C., **Wynekoop, J**. Harrington, T., Nakatani, K., Ruiz-Torres, A., Johnson, D., Boggs, R., and Pendergast, M., "Information Technology Strategies for Internet-based Education." *Journal of Informatics Education and Research*, 3(1) 2001, 27-42.

Wynekoop, J., Johnson, D. & Finan, J. "Enterprise Network Design: How Is It Done?" In *Realigning Research and Practice in Information Systems Development: The Social and Organizational Perspective,* N.L. Russo, B. Fitzgerald & J.I. DeGross (editors). Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston, 2001, 87-94 (Book chapter.)

Wynekoop, J.L. & Walz, D.B. "Investigating Traits of Top Performing Software Developers". *Information Technology & People*, 13(3), 2000, 186-195.

Wynekoop, J.L. & Walz, D.B. "Revisiting the Perennial Question: Are I.S. People Different?" The *Data Base for Advances in Information Systems*, Vol. 29(2), 1998, 62-72.

Dietrich, G.B., Walz, D.B. & **Wynekoop**, J.L. "The Failure of SDT Diffusion: A Case for Mass Customization." *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, 44, (4), 1997, 390-398.

Walz, D.B. & **Wynekoop**, J.L. "Identifying and Cultivating Exceptional Software Developers". *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, XXXVII (4), 1997, 82-87.

Wynekoop, J.L. & Russo, N.L. "Studying System Development Methodologies: An Examination of Research Methods." *Information Systems Journal*, 7(1), 1997, 47-66.

Suggestions for Making Your Case

The resting of one's case for the establishment of journal rigor could encompass the following information:

- How the journal ranks in published studies of journal rigor
- The acceptance rate of the journal as revealed from correspondence with the journal editor
- A listing of the members of the journal's editorial review board
- Citations or references to one's work in other publications (e.g., textbooks, refereed and non-refereed published works, as well as conference proceedings)
- Commentary on the rigor of one's work from three external reviewers who have been selected from a list provided by the candidate to both the department chair and the Peer Review Committee
- Indications of how one's research supports the College's mission. Accordingly, faculty are encouraged to engage in a wide array of scholarship (mostly applied and pedagogical), including applied research that contributes to the economic development of S.W. Florida. Basic research will also be well received by the Peer Review Committee.
- Indications of how one's research relates to one's teaching for the purpose of establishing AACSB International's academic qualifications (AQ)

FOOTNOTE

*   For the purpose of establishing a numerical count, published refereed works encompassing cases, textbook chapters, and academic books will be accepted provided that they denote a minor portion of a candidate's portfolio of scholarship.

C.   SERVICE

Demonstrated service is measured by meaningful contributions to university, college, department committees, and service to professional organizations; and/or community activities. This includes service such as active, contributing committee memberships, leadership in professional organizations and service to the community. The measures that will be considered in the evaluation of performance in service are listed at the end of this section. Weights given to measures of service may vary for individual situations.

Promotion from Assistant to Associate

A successful candidate shall demonstrate a continuous level of service related activities. This would include both services internal to the university and to the community. Internal examples would include serving on department, college, and university level committees and special task forces.   Community level service should be shown for the academic community, the professional community, and the local community. Academic community examples include reviewing papers for journals and conferences, editing newsletters, acting as session chairs at conferences, and other roles.   Professional community service could include consulting, employee training and conducting seminars for profit as well as non profit firms. Local community service could include serving on advisory boards and participating in fund raisers for charitable organizations. As a rough measure, successful candidates will be expected to show that they have served on at least three university-related committees (department, college, or university) and have two external service tasks for each year under review.

Promotion from Associate to Full

In addition to demonstrating a continuous level of service related activities, those seeking promotion from associate to full professor must also demonstrate that they have taken on leadership roles and have achieved a level of national/international recognition. Examples of leadership roles include serving as committee chairs, being officers in national organizations, being a general chair or program chair for conferences, and serving as an editor of a journal. Achieving a level of national recognition can be demonstrated in many ways, such as, serving as an officer for national organizations, publishing in national/international journals, serving as an invited speaker, presenting at national/international conferences, and receiving national/international awards or other recognitions.

Documenting Service

A successful candidate will document service, noting beginning and ending dates of each task, number of hours committed, and outcome (if any) of the work, including:

- Involvement in academic organizations
- Involvement in professional organizations
- Student organization activities
- University – committees, leadership roles
- Department – committees, leadership roles

- Leadership roles in community organizations
- College – committees, leadership roles
- Editorial board membership
- Officer in professional organizations
- Mentoring
- Involvement in outside boards
- Presentations to community groups
- Organizing symposia, workshops, meetings
- Conducting training sessions for profit and non profit entities
- University consulting
- Private consulting
- Pro-Bono consulting
- Conducting continuing professional education seminars
- Service awards
- Accrediting, licensing, and agency roles
- Involvement in institutes
- Discussant, chair sessions at conferences
- Reviewing articles
- Reviewing books for publishers
- Grant applications
- Grants received

D.   Timeline

· Normally conducted during the spring semester; promotion occurs in the immediately following fall semester.
· January 16: Faculty member's letter of intent to go up for promotion to VPAA.
· January 30: Documentation submitted to the supervisor (Chair, for the LCOB).
· February 28: Peer review committee submits recommendation to supervisor (Dean, for the LCOB).
· Dean of Planning and Evaluation will provide the results of the peer faculty poll to the supervisor (Dean, for the LCOB).
· March 15: Dean makes recommendation to VPAA.
· March 30: VPAA makes recommendation for or against promotion and advises the faculty of that decision.